

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

June, 1951

| | |
|---|-----|
| HENRY J. WEBB. <i>Two Additions to the Military Bibliography of Thomas Digges</i> | 131 |
| ARTHUR BROWN. <i>A Note on Sebastian Westcott and the Plays Presented by the Children of Paul's</i> | 134 |
| DANIEL A. FINEMAN. <i>The Case of the Lady "Killed" by Alexander Pope</i> | 137 |
| JOHN TYREE FAIN. <i>Ruskin and Mill</i> | 150 |
| W. H. G. ARMYTAGE. <i>Some New Letters of Robert Browning, 1871-1889</i> | 155 |
| TYRUS HILLWAY. <i>Melville as Amateur Zoologist</i> | 159 |
| JOHN J. PARRY. <i>A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Year 1950</i> | 165 |
| OSKAR SEIDLIN. <i>Picaresque Elements in Thomas Mann's Work</i> | 183 |
| JOHN HENNIG. <i>A Note on Goethe and Francis Bacon</i> | 201 |
| A. LYTTON SELLS. <i>'La Chartreuse de Parme': The Problem of Composition</i> | 204 |
| LEROY J. BENOIT. <i>Poetic Themes of Paul Eluard</i> | 216 |
| REVIEWS | 230 |
| BOOKS RECEIVED | 253 |

Volume Twelve

Number Two

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS
SEATTLE

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Edited by
EDWARD GODFREY COX
Managing Editor

DUDLEY D. GRIFFITH

CURTIS C. D. VAIL

ABRAHAM C. KELLER

Direct Contributions and Business Correspondence to
Managing Editor, Modern Language Quarterly
Parrington Hall
University of Washington
Seattle 5

Subscription price \$2.00 per year • Single copies \$0.75
Issued in March, June, September, December

Entered as second-class matter May 6, 1940, at the post office at Seattle, Washington,
under the Act of March 3, 1879

PRINTED IN U. S. A.



MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Volume Twelve

June, 1951

Number Two

ARTICLES

| | |
|--|-----|
| Henry J. Webb. Two Additions to the Military Bibliography of Thomas Digges | 131 |
| Arthur Brown. A Note on Sebastian Westcott and the Plays Presented by the Children of Paul's | 134 |
| Daniel A. Fineman. The Case of the Lady "Killed" by Alexander Pope | 137 |
| John Tyree Fain. Ruskin and Mill | 150 |
| W. H. G. Armytage. Some New Letters of Robert Browning, 1871-1889 | 155 |
| Tyrus Hillway. Melville as Amateur Zoologist | 159 |
| John J. Parry. A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Year 1950 | 165 |
| Oskar Seidlin. Picaresque Elements in Thomas Mann's Work | 183 |
| John Hennig. A Note on Goethe and Francis Bacon | 201 |
| A. Lytton Sells. <i>La Chartreuse de Parme</i> : The Problem of Composition | 204 |
| Leroy J. Benoit. Poetic Themes of Paul Eluard | 216 |

REVIEWS

| | |
|---|-----|
| E. Talbot Donaldson. <i>Piers Plowman: The C-Text and Its Poet</i> [<i>Morton W. Bloomfield</i>] | 230 |
| J. Le Gay Brereton. <i>Writings on Elizabethan Drama</i> [<i>Paul H. Kocher</i>] | 231 |
| F. H. Anderson. <i>Philosophy of Francis Bacon</i> [<i>Arnold Stein</i>] | 232 |
| John Harrington Smith. <i>The Gay Couple in Restoration Comedy</i> [<i>Donald B. Clark</i>] | 233 |
| Willard Connely. <i>Young George Farquhar</i> [<i>R. W. Babcock</i>] | 234 |
| John Arthos. <i>The Language of Natural Description in Eighteenth-Century Poetry</i> [<i>Robert C. Elliott</i>] | 236 |
| Richard D. Altick. <i>The Cowden Clarkes</i> [<i>James R. Caldwell</i>] | 237 |
| Randall Stewart. <i>Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Biography</i> [<i>Sophus Keith Winther</i>] | 238 |
| Cyril Connolly. <i>Enemies of Promise</i> [<i>Wayne Burns</i>] | 239 |
| Curt von Faber du Faur and Kurt Wolff. <i>Tausend Jahre Deutscher Dichtung</i> [<i>Franz René Sommerfeld</i>] | 241 |
| Otto Paul. <i>Deutsche Metrik</i> [<i>Clair Hayden Bell</i>] | 243 |
| Wilhelm Stapel. <i>Luthers Lieder und Gedichte</i> [<i>Clair Hayden Bell</i>] | 244 |
| Philip Motley Palmer. <i>The Influence of English on the German Vocabulary to 1700</i> [<i>Richard J. Browne</i>] | 244 |
| Hans Kurath. <i>A Word Geography of the Eastern United States</i> [<i>Carroll E. Reed</i>] | 245 |
| M. B. Ellis. <i>Julie or La Nouvelle Héloïse</i> [<i>Robert L. Politzer</i>] | 247 |
| Daniel Mornet. <i>Rousseau: L'homme et l'œuvre</i> [<i>Marcel Françon</i>] | 250 |
| Books Received | 253 |

TWO ADDITIONS TO THE MILITARY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THOMAS DIGGES

By HENRY J. WEBB

Thomas Digges, one-time mustermaster general of Queen Elizabeth's forces in the Low Countries, has been credited by Thompson Cooper in the *Dictionary of National Biography* with writing four military books:

- (1) *A geometrical practise named Pantometria* (1571; 2d ed. 1591)
- (2) *An arithmetical militare treatise named Stratitoticos* (1579; 2d ed. 1590)
- (3) *Four paradoxes* (1604)
- (4) *England's defence* (1686)¹

Mr. Cooper notes that *England's defence* was also appended to the second edition of *Stratitoticos*.

Two more books may be added to the list. One is entitled *A brieve report of the militarie services done in the Low Countries by the erle of Leicester* (1587); the other, *A breife and true report of the proceedings of the earle of Leycester for the reliefe of Sluce* (1590). Mr. Cooper is aware of the existence of the second title, but he states that it was added to the second edition of *Stratitoticos*. This is not precisely correct. The 1590 edition of *Stratitoticos* was printed by R. Field. *A breife and true report* was printed by T. Orwin for A. Maunsell. Then the two pamphlets were bound within the same covers, a fact which led Mr. Cooper to believe that the latter had been appended to the former. Actually, Digges did prepare *A breife and true report* as an addition to his larger work, for, after ten pages devoted to Leicester's abortive campaign to relieve the besieged city of Sluys, Digges begins a new chapter with the statement that

The consideration of these important causes [i.e., military corruption] . . . hath provoked or rather enforced me (in discharge of my dutie to God almightie and her Maiestie my most gracious Soveraigne Ladie and Mistresse, upon the new Ædition of my *Stratitoticos*) to enlarge it with these Additions.²

Nevertheless, when the book was published, it was issued as an individual text, not as an addition to *Stratitoticos*.³

A breife and true report consists of much more than the title indicates. Besides an account of Leicester's attempt to relieve Sluys, which covers only ten pages of this thirty-seven page book, it contains an "Addition concerning certain chiefe officers of an Armie."

¹ *DNB*, V, 978. An earlier edition of *England's defence*, dated 1680, is still extant.

² *A breife and true report*, p. 12. Microfilm of this book was purchased from the Huntington Library with funds granted by the University Research Committee, University of Utah.

³ The *STC* lists it as a separate text under Robert Dudley, although the passage quoted above plainly indicates that Digges is the author.

This "Addition" is composed of six sections and a conclusion, as follows:

- (1) "A Conference of a good and bad Mustermaster" (pp. 13-16)
- (2) "A Briefe conference of two Pagadores, or Militarie Treasurers" (pp. 16-19)
- (3) "A Conference of two Auditors" (pp. 20-23)
- (4) "Abuses that may be practized to the great dishonour of the Prince" (pp. 24-28)
- (5) "The onely or best salve to recure such ulcerous sores" (pp. 29-30)
- (6) "A Briefe conference of two Commaunders of different properties and Conditions" (E3 recto-F1 verso)
- (7) "The Conclusion" (F1 verso-F2 recto)

These sections are valuable to the student of the Elizabethan period for several reasons. In the first place, they explain in some detail the duties of mustermasters, treasurers, and auditors, and therefore supplement the discussions found in the earlier works of Digges and in Barnabe Riche's *A path-way to military practise* (1587). Secondly, they expose the corruption by which Elizabethan soldiers were deprived of the little the queen was willing to grant them. Finally, they help explain why the incorruptible Digges was thoroughly hated by the officers and men of Leicester's army in the Low Countries.⁴

Oddly enough, neither Mr. Cooper nor the compilers of the *Short Title Catalogue* acknowledge Thomas Digges to be the author of the earlier of the two books under discussion: *A breife report of the militarie services done in the Low Countries by the erle of Leicester*. Mr. Cooper does not mention the work; the *Short Title Catalogue* lists it under Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester.⁵ But it is certainly by Digges. It is signed with his initials, "T.D." It was written "by one that served in good place" in Leicester's army;⁶ Digges was mustermaster general, a very high position. It attempts to vindicate the action of Leicester as governor-general of the United Provinces, an attempt repeated in *A breife and true report*. It relates the activities of Leicester immediately preceding the activities described in *A breife and true report*, which is obviously a sequel to the first work.⁷ And finally, it is written in Digges's inimitable style—clear, succinct, eminently military—a style such as he alone among the authors of Elizabethan newsbooks could write.

⁴ See Henry J. Webb, "The Mathematical and Military Works of Thomas Digges," *MLQ*, VI (December, 1945), 389-400.

⁵ A listing followed by the *British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books*.

⁶ See title page of *A breife report*. The Huntington Library kindly provided me with a microfilm copy of this book.

⁷ In this connection it may be pointed out that a concluding passage in the first work becomes, with slight variations, the opening remarks of the second. In the first, "T.D." writes: "the enimie never got one towne, castle, forte, or sconce, wherein any one English soldier was, nor did any one peece of service woorth the noting since his Excellencie came into the fiele with this last armie" (E1^r). In the second, Digges opens with: "no one Towne, Forte, Castle or Sconce [was] lost, or foyle receaved any way by our nation . . . till the losse

This "brieft report" covers the period from January 22, 1585, to November 23, 1586, and it is the best example in the age of the historical method applied to military tactics. Digges remarks that

what I write as done of our partie, either I sawe, and am witnes of it my selfe, or have it by the credible report of those that were the doers. What I set downe of the enimies doings, I either take it from their owne intercepted letters, or I do it upon the advertisements of our best intelligencers: who in circumstances may erre, but swa:ve not much from the truth, I thinke, in any materiall point.⁸

Beginning with Elizabeth's decision to aid the Dutch States by sending over Leicester and six or seven hundred horse, he mentions the earl's appointment as "Governour and Captaine Generall" of the United Provinces, indicates the positions held by the enemy at the time, and brings out the confusion of the Dutch people, who were "without obedience," and the Dutch soldiers, who were "in miserie and disorder for want of pay." Then, after launching into a detailed account of the first military action—the relief of Grave, in Brabant—he reports in rapid sequence the success of Leicester's troops under Count Hollock and Sir John Norris in victualing Grave, the loss of Grave, the military exploits of Colonel Martin Skenck, Sir Roger Williams, Sir Philip Sidney, and others, the exploits around Zutphen, and finally the departure on November 23, 1586, of Leicester for England. As a prose work, this pamphlet has few peers among Elizabethan military newsbooks. Only his own account of the relief of Sluys and George Gascoigne's *The spoyle of Antwerpe* equal or surpass it. As an "after action report" written by an observer, this work is matched by the Sluys account alone. Thus, it is important to have it added to the other excellent works in Digges's military bibliography.

University of Utah

of Sluyce; that being the onely thing wherein either his despiteful Enemies, or ingrate friends . . . can finde any coullor to caluminate his military actions." Introduction "To the Reader."

⁸ *A brieft report*, A3^v.

A NOTE ON SEBASTIAN WESTCOTT AND THE PLAYS PRESENTED BY THE CHILDREN OF PAUL'S

By ARTHUR BROWN

An article by James Paul Brawner in 1943 discusses some of the plays presented at court in the sixteenth century by the Children of Paul's and the Children of the Merchant Taylors School.¹ The writer is concerned generally with the type of play acted by the children's companies, and in particular with those produced by Sebastian Westcott and Richard Mulcaster. The entire article is based, however, on what is surely a serious misconception, namely, that because these men were responsible for producing these plays at court, it therefore follows that they were also the actual authors. It is stated, for example, that

Of the playwrights who wrote for the private stages and the queen's solace during the 'sixties and 'seventies, none is more important than Sebastian Westcott. . . . Of his plays that won the honor of court performance we have the titles of seven. . . . (p. 456)

And in the rather shorter section dealing with Richard Mulcaster it is similarly assumed that he was the author of the two plays under discussion. The titles, taken from Feuillerat's edition of the Revels Accounts, are as follows: *Effigia, a Tragedye* (1571); *Alkmeon* (1573); *The historie of Error* (1577); *The historie of Titus and Gisippus* (1577); *A Morrall of the marryage of Mynde and Measure* (1579); *The history of Cipio Africanus* (1580); and *A storie of Pompey* (1581). It is not proposed, in this note, to deal with the case of Richard Mulcaster, although what is said about Westcott will apply in principle to him also.

There are serious objections to the assumption that Westcott was the author of these plays, but it may be pointed out first that the conclusion of Mr. Brawner's article is hardly justified by the evidence available:

These plays of Westcott and Mulcaster, then, as narrative dramas drawn from classical sources and acted at court by the children's companies, belong roughly to the same genre. The masters of the child actors would no doubt have welcomed a good fable from any source; but since they were in the academic milieu, they naturally turned most often to the classical literary sources they knew best. (p. 464)

In view of the little we know about Westcott, this confidence in his classical knowledge is perhaps rather dangerous. Furthermore, of the twenty-seven recorded appearances of the Children of Paul's

¹ "Early Classical Narrative Plays by Sebastian Westcott and Richard Mulcaster," *MLQ*, IV (1943), 455-64.

at court during Westcott's mastership, the titles of only seven of the plays are extant, and of these seven, four apparently come from classical sources. These numbers do not warrant a conclusion such as that quoted above.

Now what evidence is there for assuming that Westcott himself was the author of these plays? In the first place, none of the dramatic entries in the Stationers' Register for this period gives any information about them. In the second place, not one of the plays is extant in a recognizable form, so that the possible evidence of a title page is denied to us. In the third place, the Revels Accounts, the only known authority for the existence of the plays, makes no reference to the name of the author, but simply states that they were performed by the Children of Paul's. There is nowhere, in fact, any positive statement that Westcott was the author.

Nor do the few facts that are known about Westcott help to justify such a conclusion. In spite of his position as Master of the Children, there is neither music nor literature extant which can with certainty be attributed to him. One or two attempts have been made to demonstrate his authorship of some of the anonymous plays of the period, but none of them has met with any notable success. H. N. Hillebrand, for example, in what is still the most detailed study of Westcott,² attributed to him the play *Prodigallitie* which was shown at court in 1567/8, and equates this with the extant *Contention between Liberality and Prodigality*; but he apparently admits that the mere fact of its possible production at Paul's does not necessarily imply Westcott's authorship: "if it was produced at Paul's," he says, "it was probably written by the master of the boys." C. W. Roberts later tried to show that Westcott was the "Mr S" who wrote *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, but the evidence produced was far from convincing.³ The conclusion simply has to be faced, that there is at present nothing to show that Westcott ever put pen to paper in the way of dramatic composition.

We are, however, in possession of evidence which shows that other dramatists, whose names and works are known, had connections with the Children of Paul's, and in some cases wrote plays for the company. Professor A. W. Reed produced evidence of John Heywood's association with these boys,⁴ and came to the conclusion that on the whole

the evidence points to Heywood being associated with St. Paul's, or "called in" there and elsewhere, to manage, collaborate, or advise. He was the author or joint author of plays and the deviser or joint deviser of pageants, and where so much is uncertain we can at least, I think, postulate his association with Redford and Westcott. (p. 61)

² "Sebastian Wescote, Dramatist and Master of the Children of Paul's," *JEGP*, XIV (1915), 568-84.

³ "The Authorship of *Gammer Gurton's Needle*," *PQ*, XIX (1940), 97-113.

⁴ *Early Tudor Drama* (London, 1926), p. 56 et. seq.

Redford was Westcott's predecessor as Master of the Children, and the present writer was able more recently to add to the evidence already produced by Professor Reed for the collaboration between these men.⁶ Sir E. K. Chambers had also accepted the theory that Heywood may very well have supplied the St. Paul's company with plays both in the time of Redford and of Westcott.⁷

It is not, of course, for one moment suggested that Heywood himself was the author of any of the plays under discussion; but it is urged that his connection with the company lends support to the contention that the Master of the Children was not necessarily the author of those plays which he produced with his boys. Even clearer is the example of John Lyly, five of whose plays, according to the title pages, were acted by the Children of Paul's. The occasion of three of these has been fixed with a considerable degree of accuracy by Chambers,⁷ and they occur during the time that Thomas Giles was Master of the Children. Chambers points out that there is nothing to show that Lyly ever had any official connection with Colet's school, or with the choir school, and adds,

the probabilities are that Lyly's relation as dramatist to Giles as responsible manager of the company was much that which had formerly existed between John Heywood and Sebastian Westcott. (p. 18)

Finally, under the masterships of Edward Pearce and Edward Kirkham the Children of Paul's are known to have performed plays by Marston, Chapman, and Middleton.

It is clear, therefore, that without further evidence we are not justified in ascribing to Sebastian Westcott the authorship of those plays which were produced under his guidance. All the available evidence points to the fact that the children's companies were prepared to act plays written by established playwrights, either because they were written especially for a particular company, or because, in the words of the Revels Accounts themselves, applied to a group of six plays of which *Effigia* was one, these were "the best that then were to be had." The Master himself may have written plays—we have the evidence of Redford's *Wyt and Science* for this—but his boys were by no means confined to his own literary efforts. And until we know a good deal more about Master Sebastian, we must continue to treat his claim to any of these plays as *not proved*.

University College, London

⁶ "Two Notes on John Redford," *MLR*, XLIII (1948), 508-10; "Three Notes on Sebastian Westcott," *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 229-32.

⁷ *Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), II, 13.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 17-18.

THE CASE OF THE LADY "KILLED" BY
ALEXANDER POPE

By DANIEL A. FINEMAN

The charge that Alexander Pope murdered a lady has long been one of the unsolved mysteries in the annals of eighteenth-century literature. Neither the supposed victim's identity, nor the motive or method or, as De Quincey would say, the artistic quality of the alleged murder, has as yet been fully established. No one, of course, has ever believed anything so absurd as that Pope literally had blood on his hands or conscience. Yet the accusation cannot be dismissed as just another of the scorpion attacks that whip their envenomed tails through so many of the contemporary libels on Pope. It is Pope himself who insists that we remember he was once charged with murder. Not content with a vague allusion in the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*—

Full ten years slander'd, did he once reply?
Three thousand Suns went down on *Welsted's* Lye
(lines 374-75)

—he went on to specify in a footnote that "This Man [i.e., Leonard Welsted] had the Impudence to tell in print, that Mr. P. had occasion'd a *Lady's* death, and to name a person he never heard of."¹ As the language and tone indicate, the accusation had grated on a sensitive spot. To add to the mystery, moreover, Welsted was not one of Curll's Grubstreet hirelings who flung mud at Pope to help earn their keep. A Whig gentleman, with whom Steele at one time lived in great familiarity,² Welsted would not have preferred the accusation unless he had been able in some fashion to believe in it himself. Somewhere there had lived a lady for whose death he could say that Pope was in a sense responsible; and he could say it with sufficient point to make it psychologically difficult for Pope to refrain from a protest. The problem thus resolves itself into the three interrelated questions of when and where the charge was made, in what form it was couched, and who the lady was. Though unable to clear up yet a fourth question, that of the truth or falsity of the accusation, the present paper proposes answers to the first three.

Fortunately, it is not necessary to start the investigation in the complete darkness that cloaked the mystery for over a century after Pope's death.³ From William Warburton to A. W. Ward, the poet's

¹ Alexander Pope, *Imitations of Horace*, ed. John Butt (London, 1939), p. 123.

² The best brief account of Welsted is found in Rae Blanchard, ed., *Correspondence of Richard Steele* (London, 1941), p. 110 n. George Aitken contributed a sketch of Welsted's life to the *DNB*.

³ In *Notes and Queries*, Ser. I, X (August, 1854), 104, "W.L." wrote that despite "all reasonable inquiry and search" he could not discover where "Welsted's lie" was circulated or who "the lady named" had been.

principal editors, with one exception, merely reprinted the "Lye" couplet and original note without comment.⁴ Only George Gilfillan tried his hand at explanation with the claim that Welsted "accused Pope of killing a lady by a satire";⁵ and this guess—a bad one, incidentally—may have arisen from nothing more than careless haste in his usual practice of abbreviating Pope's notes. When William J. Courthope brought out the third volume of an edition of Pope's *Works* in 1881, however, a valuable clue to the mystery was for the first time made available. Only two known texts by Welsted, Courthope pointed out, can be said to charge Pope with killing a lady. The first is a passage in *One Epistle to Mr. A. Pope*, a lampoon by Welsted, Moore Smythe, and others, published in 1730, which contains a tolerably complete anthology of all the contemporary derogations of Pope. In this satire, among many more abusive salutations, Pope was hailed as the bard

Who from the skies, propitious to the fair,
Brought down Caecilia, and sent Cloris there.

In a footnote Welsted and his collaborators pointed the allusion to Pope's *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady*.⁶ The second place where a similar accusation occurs is Welsted's *Of Dulness and Scandal*, published in 1732, as a counterthrust to Pope's alleged libel on the Duke of Chandos in his *Epistle to Burlington*. In the course of a vituperative demonstration that Chandos was not the only victim of Pope's malice, Welsted turned on the poet with the cry

Immur'd, whilst young, in Convents hadst thou been,
Victoria still with rapture we had seen:
But now our wishes by the Fates are crost;
We've gain'd a Thersite, and an Helen lost:
The envious planet has deceiv'd our hope;
We've lost a *St. Leger*, and gain'd a *Pope*.⁷

In thus turning up the texts in which a murder charge was spelled out, Courthope revealed the significant fact that the accusation was relatively recent (1730, 1732) when Pope took notice of it in the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* (1735). Since Pope himself appears to date the event many years before, and Courthope did not discuss the

⁴ I have examined the following editions, published in London unless otherwise indicated: William Warburton (1751 [the small octavo], 1752, 1754, 1760, 1770); Joseph Warton (1797); William L. Bowles (1806); William Roscoe (1824); A. Dyce (Boston, 1871 [a reprint of Boston, 1863, which is a reprint with additions of the 1st edition, London, 1831]); G. Croly (1835) [prints no note at all, not even Pope's]; H. F. Cary (1853); Robert Carruthers (1854); A. W. Ward (New York, 1877 [a reprint with additions of London, 1869]).

⁵ *Poetical Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. Rev. George Gilfillan (New York, 1854), I, 227. The same note appears in the Edinburgh edition of 1856.

⁶ *One Epistle to Mr. A. Pope, Occasioned by Two Epistles Lately Published* [i.e., Edward Young's *Two Epistles to Mr. Pope*], in *Works of Leonard Welsted*, ed. John Nichols (London, 1787), p. 190.

⁷ *Of Dulness and Scandal, Occasioned by the Character of Lord Timon, In Mr. Pope's Epistle to the Earl of Burlington*, Welsted's *Works*, pp. 198-99.

point, this aspect of the problem must be considered in greater detail. In a footnote to the first line of the "Lye" couplet Pope explained that "ten years" was the time elapsed "before the Author of the *Dunciad* published that Poem, till when, he never writ a word in answer to the many Scurrilities and Falsehoods concerning him."⁸ When conjoined with the note to the second line of the couplet, that Welsted had publicly accused Pope of occasioning a lady's death, these words seem to imply that Welsted printed the charge a decade before the appearance of the *Dunciad* (1728), or seventeen years before Pope brought out the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*. And in point of fact Welsted had in 1717 published *Palaemon to Caelia at Bath; or, The Triumvirate*, an attack on *Three Hours After Marriage*, a collaborative play by Pope, Gay, and Arbuthnot. Though this satire appeared eleven rather than ten years before 1728,⁹ the *Dunciad Variorum* (1729) twice listed its publication date as 1718.¹⁰ Hence *Palaemon to Caelia*, Welsted's only known literary assault on Pope prior to the *Dunciad*,¹¹ would appear to be the text to which Pope was sending his readers in his first note to the "Lye" couplet. But this reference, whether intended by Pope or not, is misleading. For *Palaemon to Caelia*, though bristling with jibes and jeers at Pope, does not anywhere even remotely implicate him in a lady's death. It is theoretically possible, of course, that Welsted could have printed the accusation somewhere else, perhaps in a fugitive squib, now lost from view, which appeared in 1717 or 1718. But it seems improbable that Pope had some such relatively remote source in mind. Whatever Welsted may have printed a decade before the *Dunciad*, he clearly and plainly, as Courthope showed, did accuse Pope of occasioning a lady's death a few years before the appearance of the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*. And Pope no less clearly and plainly recorded his familiarity with the two satires that contained the charge. In the revised edition of the *Dunciad* that appeared a few months after the

⁸ *Imitations of Horace*, ed. Butt, p. 123. Commenting on this note, Carruthers, ed. *Poetical Works of Alexander Pope* (London, 1853), IV, 119, properly observes that Pope's first reply was really the *Peri Bathous*, which appeared about two months before the *Dunciad*.

⁹ "Advertised in the *Post Boy* as published March 7, 1717; the second edition is advertised for March 13." George Sherburn, "The Fortunes and Misfortunes of *Three Hours After Marriage*," *MP*, XXIV (1926), 91 n. According to the Catalogue of the British Museum, both editions appeared. I have checked the text in Welsted's *Works*, where the poem appears on pages 36-44.

¹⁰ Note to Book II, line 293, and Appendix II, Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad*, ed. James Sutherland (London, 1943), pp. 138 and 208.

¹¹ In the Appendix to the *Dunciad Variorum*, Pope also listed *The Characters of the Times, or an Account of the Writings, Characters, &c. of Several Gentlemen libell'd by S— and P— in a late Miscellany* as a book by Welsted and Edmund Curll that had abused him before the publication of the *Dunciad*. *Dunciad*, ed. Sutherland, p. 208. But: (1) as Mr. Sutherland shows (*op. cit.*, pp. 166 and 208), the book was not by Welsted (or Curll); (2) Pope himself properly dates the book 1728: hence "ten years" could not apply; (3) though primarily, as the title indicates, an answer to the *Peri Bathous*, the book must have appeared after the publication of the 1728 *Dunciad*, for a reference to the Preface to that work occurs in the account of Welsted (p. 24).

Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, he added Welsted's *One Epistle* and *Of Dulness and Scandal* to the list of books and pamphlets attacking him after 1728.¹² Moreover, as will presently appear, the very phrasing of the note to the "Lye" couplet is especially appropriate to Welsted's accusation of but a few years before. Besides, if Welsted had printed the charge in 1717 or 1718, it is almost incredible that Pope should not have mentioned the matter in the *Dunciad Variorum* of 1729. At that time he was exerting himself to represent Welsted as a mud-diving hack employed by the daily journals. In the numerous notes in which he sniped at Welsted, however, he failed to adduce any specific evidence in support of his allegation.¹³ If Welsted had already accused him of having occasioned a lady's death, surely Pope would not have overlooked so cogent a proof of his contention. Yet the first mention Pope made of the charge was in 1735. Under the circumstances, it seems altogether likely that in that year, Pope, who knew of the recent accusation by Welsted, must have had that accusation uppermost in his mind when he wrote the note to the "Lye" couplet.

Courthope's discovery thus throws light on the date of the "Lye." Unfortunately, however, the scholar-detective also drew certain unwarranted inferences from the evidence he uncovered; and these deductions, instead of illuminating, have the effect of obscuring the exact nature of Welsted's charge. Struck by the verbal similarity of the statements in Welsted's two satires, Courthope decided that in the later *Of Dulness and Scandal* Welsted was repeating and elaborating on his earlier sneer in the *One Epistle* at Pope's *Elegy* to the memory of a romantic gentlewoman who committed suicide upon being separated from her lover. The line in *Of Dulness*,

We've lost a *St. Leger*, and gain'd a *Pope*,

Courthope explained by saying that "Welsted had no doubt heard a rumour that the name of the 'Unfortunate Lady' [of the *Elegy*] (in reality a mere poetical phantom) was *St. Leger*."¹⁴ There is, to be sure, nothing wrong a priori with this view, which, by its adoption in Mr. John Butt's edition of Pope's *Imitations of Horace*,¹⁵ has become the standard contemporary interpretation of the murder charge. Like everyone else in the eighteenth century, Welsted presumably believed the *Elegy* to have been taken in all its essential details from life. He might readily have accepted current gossip that Pope himself had been the cause of the death of the lady whom he

¹² *Dunciad*, ed. Sutherland, pp. 211-12.

¹³ See particularly Bk. II, line 268 n. (*ed. cit.*, p. 134); Bk. II, lines 293-300 and n. (*ed. cit.*, pp. 138-39); Bk. III, line 28 n. (*ed. cit.*, p. 153); and Index (*ed. cit.*, p. 245).

¹⁴ *Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. Whitwell Elwin and William J. Courthope (London, 1881), III, 270.

¹⁵ Pp. 123-24. In his *DNB* article on Welsted, Aitken also adopted the Courthope theory.

eulogized.¹⁶ And he might also have heard and recorded a rumor that the lady's name was St. Leger. But the hypothesis, particularly in its relation to the charge of murder, is not borne out by what Welsted wrote. For the passages in the two satires that can be interpreted as accusations of killing a lady do not refer to the same thing. In fact it may be doubted whether in the *One Epistle*, which makes no mention of St. Leger but clearly refers to Pope's *Elegy*, Welsted wrote anything that ought properly to be described as a charge of murder. If examined in its context and without prepossessions suggested by the later *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*, Welsted's Cloris-Caecilia couplet will be seen to mean something else. Alleging a rather long series of literary iniquities, Welsted saluted Pope as

The Bard! that first, from Dryden's thrice-glean'd page,
Cull'd his low efforts to poetic rage;
Nor pillag'd only that unrival'd strain,
But rak'd for couplets Chapman and Duck-Lane,
Has sweat each century's rubbish to explore,
And plunder'd every dunce that writ before,
Catching half lines, till the tun'd verse went round,
Complete, in smooth dull unity of sound;
Who, stealing human, scorn'd celestial fire,
And strung to Smithfield airs the Hebrew lyre;
Who taught declining Wycherley to doze
O'er wire-drawn sense that tinkl'd in the close;
To lovely F——r impious and obscene,
To mud-born Naiads faithfully unclean;
Whose raptur'd nonsense, with prophetic skill,
First taught that Ombre, which fore-ran Quadrille;
Who from the skies, propitious to the fair,
Brought down Caecilia, and sent Cloris there.¹⁷

The unifying idea in this passage is that Pope is an immoral author. He is accused of plagiarizing from Dryden and everyone else, of composing a blasphemous parody of the Psalms, of writing the bulk of the compliment to himself that appeared under Wycherley's signature, and of offering obscene insults to Arabella Fermor by acknowledging her as the model for the heroine of *The Rape of the Lock*. In the concluding couplet Welsted was continuing the same thought. Proceeding with his attack on Pope's works as embodiments of ungodliness and dishonesty, he was trying to manufacture derisive wit out of the contrast between Pope's *Ode for Music on St. Cecilia's Day* and his *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady*. They were both, he pretended, further instances of Pope's all-embracing impiety. In the *Ode*, by the mere act of daring to sing her praises, Pope had brought a saint down to earth, while in the *Elegy*, by presuming to glorify a romantic suicide, he had sacrilegiously exalted

¹⁶ E.g., *Life of . . . Mother Wybourn* (London, 1721), quoted by George Sherburn, *Early Career of Alexander Pope* (Oxford, 1934), p. 295.

¹⁷ Welsted's *Works*, pp. 189-90.

a sinner to the heavens.¹⁸ Half remembering Dryden's celebrated contrast in *Alexander's Feast* between Timotheus and St. Cecilia,

He rais'd a Mortal to the Skies,
She drew an Angel down,

Welsted pointed up the joke by calling Pope the bard

Who from the skies, propitious to the fair,
Brought down Caecilia, and sent Cloris there.

It was perhaps not a very good joke. To make it clear he had to explain in a footnote that by Cloris he meant the heroine of Pope's *Elegy*. In the same way he found it advisable to indicate at the bottom of the page that his mention of Wycherley's "wire-drawn sense" squinted at the playwright's well-known "compliment . . . upon Pope's Pastorals."¹⁹ But although to make his quips comprehensible he had to prop them up on footnotes, the point of the raillery about Cloris is obvious: its central emphasis is upon Pope's impiety, and not upon his having been involved in a murder.

Undoubtedly, if he had a mind to, Pope was quite capable of deliberately twisting the peripheral implications of the joke into meaning that he had been charged with "killing" a lady. As a matter of fact, in the *Peri Bathous*, he had already employed a somewhat similar device of ridicule by distortion against Welsted.²⁰ But in order to write in 1735 that Welsted had accused him of occasioning a lady's death, he had no need to distort the quip about his *Elegy* in the *One Epistle*. For in the more recent *Of Dulness and Scandal* (1732), Welsted had not indirectly but explicitly charged Pope with the "crime" in question; and he had done so without making the slightest reference to Pope's *Elegy*. Here is how Welsted phrased the indictment:

¹⁸ A not uncommon eighteenth-century view. Samuel Johnson, it will be remembered, inveighed against Pope's "illaudable singularity of treating suicide with respect; . . . her desires were too hot for delay, and she liked self-murder better than suspense. . . . Poetry has not often been worse employed than in dignifying the amorous fury of a raving girl." *Lives of the English Poets*, ed. George B. Hill (Oxford, 1905), III, 226 and 101. In the *Gentleman's Magazine*, LIV (1784), 807, "Parvus" admired Johnson's criticism: "There is not in all Pope's Works, a more reprehensible passage, or more contrary to the principles of society."

¹⁹ Welsted's *Works*, p. 190.

²⁰ In *Acon and Lavinia*, an Ovidian love poem, Welsted had written that his heroine's sense of justice would not

permit her to decline
His suit, who saw her, with familiar eyes,
Asleep, and only cover'd with the skies.

(Welsted's *Works*, p. 52)

For purposes of ridicule, Pope sharpened the image into
Behold the virgin lye
Naked, and only cover'd by the sky.

(Pope's *Works*, ed. Elwin and Courthope, X [1886], 378)

Ye vales of Richmond, fraught with wasting thyme!
 Ye beds of lilies, and ye groves of lime!
 Say, where is she that made those lilies bright!
 The scribbler's shame, who was the swain's delight!
 Behold the Charmer, wasting to decay;
 Like Autumn faded in her virgin May!
 To pore o'er curs'd Translation, rest she flies,
 And dims by midnight lamps her beamless eyes;
 With Iliads travestied, to age she stoops,
 In fustian withers, and o'er crambo droops.
 No conquest now, Victoria, shalt thou boast;
 The second victim to Achilles' ghost!²¹

If it were not for the general confusion about the matter created by Pope, it would always have been clear that this passage was highly relevant and that it contained another one of Welsted's jokes.²² Eager to pay Pope back for sneers in the *Peri Bathous* and the *Dunciad*, Welsted was ironically accusing him of having "killed" a lady by forcing her to read his translation of Homer's *Iliad*. Concealing her name, as polite convention required, behind the pseudonym Victoria, he identified her only as one who made the lilies bright in a garden at Richmond. This, however, was significant, for Richmond was but a few miles distant from Pope's villa at Twickenham. Welsted, in other words, was implying that she was a neighbor of Pope, no doubt with the thought that for most contemporary readers the localizing hint would give a certain authenticity to the story.

If one now recalls the particular words Pope chose in order to describe Welsted's charge, it will be seen how peculiarly appropriate they are to the story dramatized in *Of Dulness*. Pope wrote not of "murdering" or "killing" a lady, but of "occasioning a lady's death," which is precisely the role ironically assigned to him by Welsted. Further, that anyone should tell or believe the anecdote, especially if it was for any reason difficult to deny, was just the sort of thing that might provoke Pope and lead him to think and write of "Impudence" with a capital "I." When Pope said he had been accused of occasioning a lady's death, therefore, it is most unlikely that he had in mind the side glance at the *Elegy* in the *One Epistle*. The Homer story in *Of Dulness* was all the thorn he needed to wince and retaliate, and it is the thorn that fits the wound. Moreover, independent proof that he was thinking exclusively of Welsted's later satire can be found in the second sentence of the note to the "Lye" couplet. After touching on the lady's death, Pope went on to say that Welsted "also publish'd that he [i.e., Pope] had libell'd the Duke of Chan-

²¹ Welsted's *Works*, pp. 196-97.

²² Pope's commentators all fail to cite these lines. Even Nichols, who included *Of Dulness and Scandal* in his edition of Welsted's *Works*, failed to perceive the point of Welsted's irony. Thrown off the track by Pope's hocus-pocus, Nichols associated the "Lye" couplet with the St. Leger passage (thus perhaps giving the idea to Courthope), and confessed himself completely baffled by "the particulars of the allusion." Welsted's *Works*, pp. xviii n., 198 n., and 199 n.

dos."²³ This charge does not occur in the *One Epistle*. It is, however, the second principal topic in *Of Dulness*, where Chandos, though not mentioned by name, is defended under the pseudonym of Pollio from Pope's supposed libel on him in the *Epistle to Burlington*.²⁴ Pope, it is known, was quite upset by the rumor that he had ridiculed Chandos, and he did not soon forget the satires like Welsted's that helped spread the tale. His own association of ideas thus reinforces the conclusion that in referring to a lying murder charge, he was inspired by the three-year-old *Of Dulness*, with its impertinent story of how he bored his neighbor Victoria to death.

But who was Victoria? Luckily, the decorous anonymity that masked her before the common reader was not preserved in the more intimate conversation of such victims of the *Dunciad* as Lewis Theobald. In a private letter to Warburton, written shortly after the appearance of *Of Dulness* and containing copious extracts from the satire, Theobald not only explained Welsted's purpose but supplied Victoria's real name. One of the "particular Topicks wth incense M^r Welsted to animadvert on F—," Theobald wrote, is "his having reduced a very pretty Lady, Sr. Peter Vanderput's Widow, of Richmond, to a moping Frenzy wth obliging her to read over a second time his version of Homer, to make her a Mistress of its Beauties."²⁵ And lest Warburton miss the point, Theobald carefully noted, in his excerpts from Welsted's satire, that Victoria was "Lady Van—t."²⁶

The identity of "Lady Van—t" can be ascertained with a fair degree of probability. Although no Vanderputs are recorded among the titled commoners of the day, a single Vandeput family (without the *r*) does occur in the lists of knights and baronets.²⁷ Fleeing from Antwerp to England in 1568, at the time of the Duke of Alva's persecution of the Huguenots, the Vandeputs had married so well and traded so shrewdly that by the early eighteenth century they owned Bessington manor at Twickenham.²⁸ Sir Peter Vandeput, created baronet in 1723, had earlier married Frances, daughter of Sir George Matthew of Southwork and Twickenham (marriage portion £6,000), and the children of this union were christened in the Twickenham church. Though in 1726 Sir Peter purchased a second estate at Standlych, Wiltshire, where his wife and daughter were eventually buried and where he too desired to be interred, he did not give up his earlier holdings, and was still identified in 1734 as "Sir Peter Vandeput, of

²³ *Imitations of Horace*, ed. Butt, p. 123.

²⁴ Welsted again alluded to this supposed libel in *Of False Fame* (*Works*, p. 201), where he mentioned Chandos by name. It is not certain, however, that Pope saw this satire.

²⁵ January 8, 1732. Richard F. Jones, *Lewis Theobald* (New York, 1919), p. 295.

²⁶ Jones, *Theobald*, p. 296.

²⁷ See G. E. Cockayne, *Complete Baronetage*, V (Exeter, 1906), 59-60.

²⁸ Unless otherwise indicated, all information about the Vandeputs comes from Oswald Barron, "The Huguenot Families in England: III, The Vandeputs," *The Ancestor*, IV (January, 1903), 29-43, especially pp. 34-38.

Twickenham, bart."²⁹ Indeed, as late as 1803, Bessington continued to be regarded as the Vandeput family seat.³⁰ Thus at the time Welsted's poem appeared, the family of a Sir Peter Vandeput, the only one of that name and title in England, had their house in the same country parish where Pope had been living since 1718.³¹ Known for the support they had given King William, the mercantile Vandeputs had a strong Whig background,³² and this may have predisposed them to antagonism towards their neighbor Pope, whose Tory sympathies were by now fairly well pronounced. Further, the family was closely linked with the near-by Richmond mentioned by both Theobald and Welsted. The baronet's father, Sir Peter Vandeput, Kt., was described in his will as "of Richmond," and though buried in London he had been the subject of an encomiastic funeral sermon delivered in the Richmond parish church.³³ The knight's wife, Lady Margaret (£800 a year in jointure), was daughter to Sir John Buckworth of West Sheen in Richmond,³⁴ and had in 1713 founded a charity school there which was still in existence a dozen years later.³⁵ The baronet's five female cousins (daughters of his father's sister) were known as "the Richmond beauties."

Considering the nonexistence of titled Vande[r]puts, the virtual identity of that name with Vandeput, and the close connection of the latter family with Twickenham and Richmond, it appears practically certain that Theobald's pen slipped into a minor and understandable

²⁹ Matriculation record of his son, George Vandeput, later 2nd baronet, at Wadham College, Oxford. Confirmed by *Alumni Oxonienses*, ed. Joseph Foster (Oxford, 1888), IV, 1463.

³⁰ William Betham, *Baronetage of England*, III (London, 1803), 205.

³¹ Sherburn, *Pope*, p. 217.

³² This background was still very much alive in 1749, when Sir George Vandeput, Bart., contested the membership for Westminster against Lord Trentham. The election campaign was tumultuous. "Where does this foreign-sounding Vandeput come from?" cried Sir George's opponents. "Where did Lord Trentham's people stand in 1715?" hotly replied the Vandeput faction. The answer was not good enough, however, for after all votes were cast, Lord Trentham was declared elected by a majority of 157. Charging foul play, Sir George demanded a scrutiny, upon which, after the improper ballots on each side were discarded, Lord Trentham's majority was increased to 170. *Gentleman's Magazine*, XIX (1749), 521-22.

³³ Preached on May 2, 1708, by Dr. Nicholas Brady, psalmwriter, translator of Virgil, and minister of Richmond. The sermon was printed the same year in London, with a dedication to Lady Vandeput. A substantial excerpt is reprinted in John Wilford, *Memorials and Characters, together with the Lives of divers eminent and worthy persons* (London, 1741), pp. 405-06. A draper of Lime Street, Peter Vandeput was knighted on September 26, 1684, and was an Alderman of London and Sheriff in 1684-1687. Alfred B. Beaven, *Aldermen of the City of London* (London, 1908-1913), I, 177 and II, 111.

³⁴ John Buckworth, fishmonger, rose to be Deputy-Governor of the Levant Company (1672-1687) and Alderman of London (1683-1686). He was knighted on June 18, 1681. Beaven, *Aldermen of London*, II, 110. In his funeral sermon (preached December 19, 1687, at St. Peter's le Poor; printed London, 1688; and reprinted Wilford's *Memorials*, pp. 604-05) he is described as "a Prince among Merchants and an Oracle of Trade."

³⁵ *Victoria History of . . . Surrey*, ed. H. E. Malden, III (London, 1911), 541.

error.³⁶ Victoria was a Lady Vandeput—presumably, to judge from Welsted's and Theobald's description of her, the baronet's wife. Lady Frances Vandeput, who, according to the inscription on her coffin, "died March 3rd, 1764, aged 68 years,"³⁷ was in her mid-thirties in late 1731 and might well at that time have been a "Charmer" and "a very pretty Lady." Theobald, however, calls Pope's supposed victim a widow, and this the Lady Frances was not, her husband not dying until August 25, 1748, at Mayence, in Germany.³⁸ The only person properly describable as Sir Peter Vandeput's widow late in 1731 was Lady Margaret, the baronet's mother, whose husband had died in April, 1708. But she would seem to be ruled out on the grounds of age. Married in 1674, she is said to have borne twenty-two children, of which eleven have been traced by genealogists. In 1731, therefore, she was distinctly an aged if not a venerable woman. Some fifteen years earlier, in 1717, as landlady to Richard Steele, she had inspired that gentleman to describe her as "that Hagg Lady Vandeput."³⁹ This characterization is, of course, scarcely conclusive, since Steele was quarreling with her at the time over the payment of rent. But the fact that she died in December, 1738, at the age of 84,⁴⁰ and would therefore have been seventy-seven in late 1731, should preclude Welsted's describing her as "the swain's delight." There is a bare possibility that Welsted was trying to suggest that the old lady's withered, drooping, stooping appearance—the adjectives come from the lines in *Of Dulness*—was due to Pope's Homer. If so, Theobald misunderstood, as well he might, this oversubtle irony within an irony, and wrongly inferred that she was "a very pretty lady." It appears much more likely, however, that Welsted heard the story told of Lady Frances, the wife of Sir Peter Vandeput, and that Theobald, who knew that a Sir Peter Vandeput's widow was living, confused the marital title of the daughter-in-law with that of the mother-in-law.

If Victoria was a Lady Vandeput, however, there remains the problem of the St. Leger who, it will be remembered, played an important role in Courthope's theory about the murder charge. Clearly, since St. Leger appears only in *Of Dulness* and refers to Victoria, the victim of the Homer-reading episode, the name cannot be, as Courthope suggested, Welsted's guess at the identity of the

³⁶ In *London, Past and Present* (London, 1891), I, 311, Henry B. Wheatley falls into the same misspelling when he refers to Lady Margaret Vandeput as "a Mrs. Vanderput."

³⁷ Richard D. Hoare, *Modern History of South Wiltshire: III, Hundred of Dorchester* (London, 1834), p. 49.

³⁸ Announced in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, XVIII (1748), 427.

³⁹ Steele to Lady Steele, August 23 or 24, 1717. Steele's *Correspondence*, ed. Blanchard, p. 367. A few weeks later (September 14), Steele grudgingly conceded that she was "of the Fair sex" (*ibid.*, p. 372).

⁴⁰ "Hist. Reg. Chron. 49," cited by George Aitken, *Life of Richard Steele* (London, 1889), II, 142. Confirmed by Barron, *The Ancestor*, IV, 35, who notes that the baronet proved his mother's will on January 15, 1739.

heroine of Pope's *Elegy*. Yet if St. Leger also was not the real name of the lady who was subjected to a murderous perusal of Pope's *Iliad*, then who was she? One explanation is that Welsted was simply providing the pseudonymous Victoria with an equally pseudonymous family name. But another explanation is possible. St. Leger may have been part of another one of Welsted's ambiguous jokes, the first ambiguity being that, except in metaphor, she wasn't a she at all, but a he. St. Leger, the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* informs us, was barbarously mutilated before being beheaded by Ebroin in the year 678, and is "one of the most famous of French saints."⁴¹ The popularity of the martyr, who is listed even in the small Larousse, is further attested to, according to the *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, by "les nombreuses églises placées sous son invocation en Bourgogne, en Alsace et dans les Flandres."⁴² St. Leger and something of his story may therefore have been familiar to Welsted, who had a sufficient knowledge of French to have translated Longinus from Boileau's translation,⁴³ and to have written familiarly of Fontenelle and Fénelon.⁴⁴ To understand what Welsted might have been getting at with a reference to the French saint, it may be convenient to set down the context again:

Immur'd, whilst young, in Convents hadst thou been,
Victoria still with rapture we had seen:
But now our wishes by the Fates are crost;
We've gain'd a Thersite, and an Helen lost:
The envious planet has deceiv'd our hope;
We've lost a St. Leger, and gain'd a Pope.⁴⁵

Opposing good to evil, Welsted first compared Victoria to the desirable, stately Helen of Troy, and Pope to Thersites, the crippled malice-monger of the *Iliad*. No one could misunderstand, he knew, for the application of Thersites to Pope was a favorite cliché of the duncified. But he evidently wished to reinforce the thought. Accordingly, two lines below, he developed what can be interpreted as a similar antithesis, extracted from religious materials and topped off with a pun as hackneyed as the Thersites quip. The parallel between St. Leger and the lady, to be sure, is rather forced. Not only is there the difference in sex, but if Welsted knew the details of the

⁴¹ William Smith and Henry Wace, ed., III (London, 1882), 684-86.

⁴² F. Lichtenberger, ed., VIII (Paris, 1880), 79.

⁴³ Advertised in the *Spectator* for May 7, 1712 (No. 372), as "the Works of that wise Critick Dionysius Longinus; or, *A Treatise concerning the Sovereign Perfection of Writing*; faithfully translated from the Greek by Mr. Welsted." L. Lewis, *Advertisements of the Spectator* (Cambridge, Mass., 1910), pp. 172-73. For the charge that Welsted's Longinus was "Translated from Boileau's Translation," see Swift's *On Poetry: A Rhapsody* (1733), in *Poems of Jonathan Swift*, ed. H. Williams (Oxford, 1937), II, 649. For evidence, see John Jortin, *Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors, Ancient and Modern* (London, 1731), I, 70-72.

⁴⁴ *Works*, pp. 149 and 165.

⁴⁵ *Works*, pp. 198-99.

monstrous treatment the saint underwent,⁴⁶ he must have realized they did not apply too well to what he said of the lady's "martyrdom." Further, the elements in the line are ill balanced, since the lady's name was not St. Leger, while Pope's was identical with the title of the Catholic pontiff. As for the pun itself, with its sneering innuendo that a pious, good martyr contrasts sharply with the head of the Roman Church, the poverty of the idea scarcely requires comment. Yet to bait Pope for being a Catholic was standard operating procedure with *Dunciad* victims, and it may have been in order to carry on this tradition that Welsted dragged in the wretched, quibbling reference to St. Leger. If this was his purpose, he apparently considered that though the allusion did not altogether fit, it came near enough, and was worth including for the spice that the anti-Catholic sentiment would add to his satire.

But it was not a slur on his faith that made it difficult for Pope to brush off *Of Dulness* as a mere bagatelle. As the two lines and the two attached notes in the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* reveal, what he had been unable to forget, after the passage of three years, was the twin theme of Welsted's satire—the accusation that he had libeled Chandos, and the anecdote about Lady Vandeput. Unfortunately, the present investigation has been unable to discover whether that anecdote was based on fact. It may be that Welsted was only too willing to credit a story that was actually without foundation. Or perhaps the charge rested on a slender basis of truth, such as a chance remark by Pope that several lines in his *Iliad* conveyed the sense of the original pretty accurately. As an unfriendly witness later reported the incident to her Whig friends, she may have said something to the effect that the little Tory poet could drive one to a frenzy, the way he obliged people to admire his Homer. But whether the story was even in some measure true, there can be no doubt that Pope was vexed to see it in print. In his letter to Warburton, Theobald concluded: "And if P— be as sensible on these Rebukes as 'tis said he is, I wish (& don't let the Word undergo the Torture of an irony) his intermitting Headach do not turn to a settled Agony."⁴⁷ Theobald's vindictive hope—for he protests too much about *not* being ironical to be believed—was at least partly fulfilled. And then, when Pope pondered retaliation, he perceived that the irksome anecdote about Lady Vandeput could readily be turned against its circulator. Poetaster Welsted had been so impudent as to print a discreditable story about him? Very well, Pope decided, let Welsted be the one to appear before the world as a ridiculous figure.

The strategy was clever. As a start, though of course much too expert himself in such subtleties to have mistaken Welsted's ironical intent, Pope solemnly affected to take the story seriously. Welsted,

⁴⁶ *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, III, 684-86. See also *Catholic Encyclopedia*, IX (New York, 1910), 174.

⁴⁷ Jones, *Theobald*, p. 297.

he wrote, had literally and lyingly accused him of occasioning a lady's death—had gone so far as to name a lady of whom he had never heard. This was all in a sense true, especially so far as the names Victoria or St. Leger were concerned; and gentlemanly Welsted, he could be relatively certain, was no more likely in the future than in the past to violate decorum by disclosing the lady's identity. Most of his readers, Pope could therefore assume, would suppose that Welsted was a crack-brained libeler. By further suggesting (though not explicitly stating) that Welsted had voiced the accusation seventeen years before, amid other libels and scurrilities, Pope made it difficult for anyone to check up on what Welsted really had written and where he had written it. As for the few who might come upon the three-year-old *Of Dulness*, of which there were probably some copies still lying about, they would at once perceive that with all his "truth-telling," Pope was really pulling Welsted's leg. But this would increase rather than still their laughter at the poor fellow who had printed the Homer story. The almost hysterically vituperative tone of Welsted's lampoon⁴⁸ would make them feel that he deserved Pope's sardonic and contemptuous misrepresentation.

The mystery of the murder at Richmond (or was it Twickenham?) thus turns out to be largely of the culprit's own making. It might be described as the curious case of the man who cast a small shadow upon himself in order to cast a much larger shadow upon someone he disliked. So adroitly did he handle the matter, indeed, that the truth or falsity of Welsted's ironical accusation remains uncertain. But the precise place where the charge was preferred has been discovered, the nature, motive, and method of the alleged crime have been disclosed, and a "corpse" to meet the specifications of the indictment has been produced.

University of Pennsylvania

⁴⁸ Sample epithets applied to Pope are: coxcomb, spy, demon, bigot, atheist, church-pander, pimp.

RUSKIN AND MILL

By JOHN TYREE FAIN

Ruskin selected John Stuart Mill as one of his opponents in a crusade against the accepted political economy of nineteenth-century England. It is therefore with some surprise that the student recognizes good Mill doctrine here and there in Ruskin's works. As an introduction to a consideration of Ruskin's attitude toward Mill, let us notice one of Ruskin's best-known passages (from *Unto This Last*) and place it beside a passage from Mill:

Perhaps one of the most curious facts in the history of human error is the denial by the common political economist of the possibility of thus regulating wages; while, for all the important, and much of the unimportant, labour, on the earth, wages are already so regulated.

We do not sell our prime-ministership by Dutch auction; nor, on the decease of a bishop, whatever may be the general advantages of simony, do we (yet) offer his diocese to the clergyman who will take the episcopacy at the lowest contract. We (with exquisite sagacity of political economy!) do indeed sell commissions; but not openly, generalships: sick, we do not inquire for a physician who takes less than a guinea; litigious, we never think of reducing six-and-eightpence to four-and-sixpence; caught in a shower, we do not canvass the cabmen, to find one who values his driving at less than sixpence a mile.¹

Ruskin says that the "common political economist" denies the possibility of regulating wages without regard to supply and demand; yet his passage is so similar to the following one from Mill's *Principles* that it might easily be thought merely an amplification of Mill's statement:

In many trades the terms on which business is done are a matter of positive arrangement among the trade. . . . All professional remuneration is regulated by custom. The fees of physicians, surgeons, and barristers, the charges of attorneys, are nearly invariable.²

Is not Mill, then, a "common political economist"? Much evidence could be cited to show that Mill's economy qualifies nineteenth-century orthodox economics sufficiently to be considered a transition to later theory. However, since Ruskin uses illustrations from Mill's works on various occasions after speaking of the views of "ordinary" or "common" or "vulgar" political economists, it is apparent that he has Mill in mind.

Should we pronounce Ruskin's statement a conscious misrepresentation of fact? It is clear that Ruskin knew Mill's *Principles* better than he knew any other treatise on political economy; it is also clear that he often found there only what his preconceptions led him to look for. When he finds himself in total disagreement—

¹ *Works of John Ruskin*, ed. Cook and Wedderburn (London, 1903-12), XVII, 33.

² *Principles of Political Economy*, ed. W. J. Ashley (London, 1926), p. 247.

for instance, with Mill's definition of wealth—he ridicules Mill without reserve (pp. 18-19). When he finds himself in partial agreement, he still ridicules and attempts to show that Mill does not understand the purport of his own statements. For instance, Ruskin states:

I should have regretted the need of pointing out inconsistency in any portion of Mr. Mill's work, had not the value of his work proceeded from its inconsistencies. He deserves honour among economists by inadvertently disclaiming the principles which he states, and tacitly introducing the moral considerations with which he declares his science has no connection. Many of his chapters are, therefore, true and valuable; and the only conclusions of his which I have to dispute are those which follow from his premises. (p. 79)

This is not the place to attempt to justify Mill's method. It may be noted in passing, however, that no social scientist of Mill's stature would formulate his principles without reference to residual categories.

A striking example of Ruskin's treatment of Mill occurs in *Time and Tide*. Ruskin quotes the following passage from Mill's *Principles*:

in no sound theory of private property was it ever contemplated that the proprietor of land should be merely a sinecurist quartered on it.³

Then he says:

But Mr. Mill instantly retreats from this perilous admission; and after three or four pages of discussion . . . he begs the whole question at issue in one brief sentence, slipped cunningly into the middle of a long one which appears to be telling all the other way, and in which the fatal assertion (of the right to rent) nestles itself, as if it had been already proved,—thus—I italicise the unproved assertion in which the venom of the entire falsehood is concentrated.

"Even in the case of cultivated land, a man whom, though only one among millions, the law permits to hold thousands of acres as his single share, is not entitled to think that all is given to him to use and abuse, and deal with it as if it concerned nobody but himself. *The rents or profits which he can obtain from it are his, and his only*; but with regard to the land, in everything which he abstains from doing, he is morally bound, and should, whenever the case admits, be legally compelled to make his interest and pleasure consistent with the public good." (pp. 442-43)

Mill evidently intends the italicized statement to be interpreted legally; Ruskin interprets it morally. The important thing to notice here, however, is that twenty years later (1868) Mill amplified the argument which Ruskin terms self-contradictory, and applied it to the Irish land situation in the pamphlet *England and Ireland*. In that year Ruskin pasted in his copy of Mill's *Principles*, close to the passage just quoted, a clipping from the *Pall Mall Gazette* criticizing the pamphlet. Beside it he wrote, "Mill right at last, and attacked for being so" (p. 444 n.). But Mill is as "right" in the passage Ruskin objects to as he is in the pamphlet. Except for the attack, Ruskin might well have found the pamphlet full of contradictory equivocation. And though Ruskin thus confesses privately a community of opinion

³ *Works*, XVII, 442.

with Mill, he never publishes such an admission, and he continues to heap scorn upon Mill throughout *Fors Clavigera*.

So much for Ruskin's general attitude toward Mill. Let us consider one or two examples of Ruskin's controversial method in somewhat more detail in order to evaluate Ruskin's argument. It seems only fair, however, to preface this consideration with a warning. No matter how conclusive the evidence may be, one hesitates to call Ruskin either stupid or deceitful. The dilemma loses its meaning in the light of Ruskin's characteristic irony, often manifested in the form of ignorance feigned for the purpose of exposing an opponent's confused thinking.

Ruskin begins the last essay of *Unto This Last* with the following criticism of Mill:

Mr. J. S. Mill instances, as a capitalist, a hardware manufacturer, who, having intended to spend a certain portion of the proceeds of his business in buying plate and jewels, changes his mind, and "pays it as wages to additional workpeople." The effect is stated by Mr. Mill to be, that "more food is appropriated to the consumption of productive labourers."

Now I do not ask, though, had I written this paragraph, it would surely have been asked of me, What is to become of the silversmiths? If they are truly unproductive persons, we will acquiesce in their extinction. . . . But I very seriously inquire why ironware is produce, and silverware is not? . . . The merchant is an agent of conveyance to the consumer in one case, and is himself the consumer in the other: but the labourers are in either case equally productive, since they have produced goods to the same value, if the hardware and the plate are both goods. (pp. 77-78)

Throughout the passage Ruskin is arguing beside the question. In the first place, Mill is using the hardware illustration to show what is capital and what is not. Capital, says Mill, is that part of a man's possessions which is to constitute his fund for carrying on fresh production. All Mill is saying, then, is that when a man decides to manufacture more hardware, he uses a part of his income which is called capital, and when that part of his income is so used, it is said to be used productively, since it is used to feed, house, and furnish tools for workmen who are producing.

On the other hand, Mill is saying that when a man decides to buy plate, he is not employing his money productively. But Mill does not mean in this passage, as Ruskin assumes that he does, that laborers employed to produce plate are less productive than those employed to produce hardware. Such might be the case, since hardware is more likely to be used in further productive processes, but Mill is not here considering that part of the problem. Let us change the illustration somewhat. Suppose that Mill's merchant had planned to buy a fine collection of display pistols and that he decided instead to invest the money in the manufacture of silver plate. He has in that case decided against unproductive expenditure on ironware in favor of productive expenditure on silverware. In other words, Mill

is speaking of immediate production, Ruskin of the replacement of the article which called forth the unproductive expenditure. But though Ruskin's argument is inapplicable to Mill's passage on capital, Ruskin is really taking issue on the distinction between "productive" and "unproductive" in Mill's works. Let us notice, then, Mill's distinction before considering further Ruskin's criticism.

Having treated of productive labor as that kind of labor which is an indispensable factor of production, Mill says that production is not always the purpose of labor:

There is much labour, and of a high order of usefulness, of which production is not the object. Labour has accordingly been distinguished into Productive and Unproductive. (p. 44)

Note in the above passage that unproductive labor may be highly useful. And he states in the following one that to call labor unproductive is not to censure it:

Production not being the sole end of human existence, the term unproductive does not necessarily imply any stigma; nor was ever intended to do so in the present case. (p. 44)

Then Mill defines and explains unproductive labor as follows:

All labour is, in the language of political economy, unproductive, which ends in immediate enjoyment, without any increase of the accumulated stock of permanent means of enjoyment. And all labour, according to our present definition, must be classed as unproductive, which terminates in a permanent benefit, however important, provided that an increase of material products forms no part of that benefit. . . . Unproductive may be as useful as productive labour; it may be more useful, even in point of permanent advantage. . . . In any case society or mankind grow no richer by it, but poorer. (p. 49)

To grow richer in Mill's sense here means to increase in "accumulated stock" for purposes of production.

Mill also makes the distinction between productive and unproductive consumption:

That alone is productive consumption, which goes to maintain and increase the productive powers of the community; either those residing in its soil, in its materials, in the number and efficiency of its instruments of production, or in its people. (p. 52)

Again, "unproductive consumption" is not a term of derogation:

It would be a great error to regret the large proportion of the annual produce, which in an opulent country goes to supply unproductive consumption. It would be to lament that the community has so much to spare from its necessities, for its pleasures and for all higher uses. (p. 53)

With Mill's distinction clearly in mind let us notice another typical passage (from *A Joy Forever*) in which Ruskin seems either to misunderstand or to misinterpret Mill's statements:

he says that a man who makes a coat, if the person who wears the coat does nothing useful while he wears it, has done no more good to society than the man who has only raised a pineapple.⁴

Mill does not say anything about doing "useful" things. He is talking about productive labor. And he does not say that a tailor is unproductively employed when making things for unproductive consumers, but only that society is not permanently richer in material things after the coat is worn out by an unproductive consumer (p. 52).

The distinction between "productive" and "unproductive" has become outmoded, and Ruskin's use of the terms is more modern than is Mill's. It was always merely a terminological distinction, and it is the terminology that Ruskin objects to. He recognizes the factual basis of the distinction in *Unto This Last*, where he portrays a commonwealth of forty agriculturists who decide to support ten of their number in unproductive occupations, scientific and educative (p. 109). Still Ruskin was wrong to ignore a terminological distinction which had been made in economic treatises since the days of the mercantilists. He complained bitterly that contemporary economists gave him no sympathetic understanding. He should have tried to give a little himself.

University of Florida

⁴ *Works*, XVI, 131 n. Time rather than Ruskin has invalidated Mill's pre-vitamin comparison!

SOME NEW LETTERS OF ROBERT BROWNING, 1871-1889

By W. H. G. ARMYTAGE

Browning's letters are fairly exhaustive, and the discovery of those written to Julia Wedgewood between 1864 and 1870 seem to have made the collection complete.¹ Recently, however, I was rummaging among some letters in the library of the University of Sheffield and discovered no less than twenty-four from Browning himself.

They were written to the wife and daughter of A. J. Mundella, a prosperous hosiery manufacturer and left-wing Liberal politician. Mundella had made a name for himself as a champion of the trade unions, and was included in Gladstone's second, third, and fourth administrations. In the last two he was in the cabinet as president of the Board of Trade. As a public figure, his house at 16 Elvaston Place was a rendezvous for a number of the lesser literary figures. Since his first public office was one which made him responsible for the public education of the country, such gatherings were to be expected. Some of the letters written to Mundella have already been published.²

Browning's letters were, however, addressed to Mrs. and Miss Mundella. There are ten addressed to Mrs. Mundella and fourteen, which are much more interesting, addressed to her daughter Maria Theresa.³ The daughter had interesting friends. Matthew Arnold (a rare conquest), R. H. Hutton, editor of the *Spectator*, and Jean Ingelow dined at Elvaston Place together with G. W. E. Russell, Anne Thackeray Ritchie, and popular clergymen. Browning was a big fish which she meant to catch. She first wrote asking for his autograph, to which he replied on May 15, 1871, with a gracious acceptance. She followed this up by asking him to dine. Unfortunately, Browning was going to the country, and in spite of his kind refusal, she lost heart, hence a long gap in the sequence of the correspondence.

But the great man came to dinner on June 11, 1873. He also met other members of the Mundella family, including Miss Mundella's sister, Mrs. Roby Thorpe. He stayed at the same hotel as the Thorpe family at Llangollen, and made a deep impression on Mrs. Thorpe's

¹ Richard Curle, *Robert Browning and Julia Wedgewood* (London, 1937).

² See my articles: "Goldwin Smith: Some Unpublished Letters," *Queens Quarterly*, LIV, No. 4 (1947-1948), 452-60; "Matthew Arnold and a Liberal Minister, 1880-5," *Review of English Studies*, XXIII (October, 1947), 355-57; "A. J. Mundella as Vice-President of the Council, and the Schools Question, 1880-85," *English Historical Review*, LXIII (January, 1948), 52-82.

³ The ten addressed to Mrs. Mundella are dated May 20, 1873; February 15, 1879; June 2, 1883; July 4, July 13, and November 12, 1884; May 18, 1886; April 24 and July 19, 1887; and July 3, 1888. The fourteen to Miss Mundella are dated May 15 and 19, 1871; then a gap of nine years; May 7 and November 10, 1880; May 7, 1881; May 8, 1882; May 9, 1883; May 19 and 20, 1884; May 8 and June 26, 1885; May 8, 1886; July 9, 1887; and May 9, 1889. All are written in Browning's own meticulous hand.

daughter, the future Lady Charnwood.⁴ The little girl used to bring him nosegays of wild flowers almost daily, and remarked later, "he had a certain excitement in his love of nature which was almost infectious." Miss Mundella followed suit, and on May 7, 1880, Browning was provoked to reply:

19 Warwick Crescent, W.

Dear Miss Mundella,

What can I say—how thank you enough for your exquisite flowers and even more valued words and wishes? You know how I match you in the second particular—unable as I am to compete with you in the first. I am proud and happy to be—of you all and everyone—the most affectionate and grateful of friends.

The summer saw them meet in Venice, of which Browning wrote to her six months later:

How pleasant an interlude mid'st troublous life was our meeting with you all in Venice! My sister and I will never forget those golden days! Our love to all who contributed to their lustre!⁵

And at the same time he sent the Mundellas a card for the private view of a picture by his son Pen. This was to be exhibited "along with others by men of greater note" at the Hanover Gallery.

It was a warm, pleasant, family relationship between the Brownings and the Mundellas. There is a letter which hints at a present from the Mundellas in the year 1881:

Dear Miss Mundella,

What am I to say—or try to say—in acknowledgement of your goodness and that of your dear father and mother? There is also a precious consignment from Nottingham which I shall have trouble in finding fit words for. But all this kind encouragement to keep on living—and—may I add,—loving, is its own reward, I must hope. At all events, you will believe,—all of you,—in the gratitude of
yours affectionately ever,

Robert Browning.

Evidently they were flowers, for a similar note was written in 1882:

Dear Miss Mundella, you are exquisitely good to me—you and all your dear ones—and I can only say I am most gratefully and affectionately yours ever,
Robert Browning.

Flowers too from Norwich—help me to express my thanks, and it shall be yet one favour more!

⁴ Lady Charnwood, *An Autograph Collection* (London, 1930), comments: "his exuberance, his normality of appearance, his vivid interest in others, made a child absolutely at home with him" (p. 219).

⁵ To Miss Mundella, November 10, 1880. A good account of Browning's life in Italy at this time was written by his hostess, Mrs. Bronson, in the *Cornhill Magazine* for February, 1902.

And again in 1883:

you know how hard I must find it to give any sort of expression to the feelings I have with respect to your goodness,—fortunately, however, you cannot but know how real and how deep they are and ever will continue to be.

Ever most affectionately and gratefully yours,
Robert Browning.

I was about to write to Mrs Thorpe, when I observe that she is—if I guess aright by the direction of the "address"—at Elvaston Place also. There is no use in varying the phrase: I love and honour you all dearly.

Browning began to lean on them. In May, 1884, he was writing to Miss Mundella, asking her to visit his sister Sarianna, who was ill. When a sudden call to Oxford looked like removing him from the scene when they visited, he did not hesitate to advance the visit so he could see them.⁶ The flowers continued to come, for in 1885 he is protesting:

every one of you laying me under what I would call the deepest of "obligations"—did not that word seem *debt*-like, while I only feel pride and pleasure in the hour of affection whereby I am ever

gratefully and altogether yours,
Robert Browning.

Such a basket from Nottingham! How have I deserved such goodness?⁷

Once more in 1886:

Again your beautiful roses, and, even better still, your beloved words! You know that, whatever words fail to say, is really underneath them in such a grateful heart as must needs be that of

yours affectionately ever,
Robert Browning.

By the year 1887 he could write, in accepting an invitation to dinner, great pleasure will it be for me to see you at least once again before we go our various ways. I shall particularly like to realise how truly I am your neighbour!

This letter and the last came from 29 De Vere Gardens, all the previous ones from 19 Warwick Crescent. The last is couched in the same vein of thanks for the roses. It closes plaintively:

Do you never come this way? Am I never to see you here? Wherever you are, all love goes to you from

yours affectionately ever,
Robert Browning.

The friendship between the two families was based on Browning's

⁶ May 19 and 20, 1884.

⁷ May 8, 1885. On June 26 he wrote a long letter of apology for not replying sooner to accept an invitation to dinner. He had gone into the country and left no directions for forwarding the letters. Nevertheless, he wished to accept the invitation to dine.

admiration for Miss Mundella's father.⁸ Sarianna continued the connection, and wrote from Italy to share the "sad anniversaries we have in common," for Mrs. Mundella died soon after Browning. The thought that Browning received a basket of roses once a year for nine years is a pleasant one, and affords a pleasanter recollection than the thought that in the summer of 1881 a Browning Society was founded to discuss his message. For of all our poets in the nineteenth century, Browning was most endowed with the social gifts and graces, and indeed might well qualify for the title of the most habitual diner-out in London.

The University, Sheffield, England

⁸ "You know how long and how highly my brother and I valued your dear father and all your family. It has been an old friendship, and your own heart will tell you how deeply I feel for you." Sarianna Browning to Miss Mundella, July 24, 1897, on the death of Miss Mundella's father.

MELVILLE AS AMATEUR ZOOLOGIST

By TYRUS HILLWAY

Though *Typee* (1846) and *Omoo* (1847) contain only scattered zoological references, and these of a sort found in the reports of almost every traveler of his day, Herman Melville's *Mardi* (1849) spreads before the reader's eyes a remarkable succession of sharks, devilfish, flying fish, blackfish, algerines, killer and thrasher whales (Chapter XIII), pilot fish, rays, remoras (Chapter XVIII), swordfish (Chapter XXXII), medusae, sperm whales, cuttlefish, microscopic mollusca (Chapter XXXVIII), silverheads, bonettas, wriggletails, triggerfish, yellowbacks (Chapter XLVIII), and scores of their salty relatives.

I commend [says Melville] the student of Ichthyology to an open boat, and the ocean moors of the Pacific. As your craft glides along, what strange monsters float by. Elsewhere, was never seen their like. And nowhere are they found in the books of the naturalists.

Though America be discovered, the Cathays of the deep are unknown. And whoso crosses the Pacific might have read lessons to Buffon.¹

Melville here is crying his wares. Like most vendors, he gives his product a little more praise than it really deserves. Far from being qualified to read any lessons to Buffon, Melville clearly leaves much to be desired (at least, from the point of view of the student of ichthyology) in his descriptions of sea life in the southern Pacific.

He was correct, of course, in asserting that naturalists of the eighteen-forties had not succeeded in classifying or even becoming remotely acquainted with vast hordes of sea dwellers. Much the same can be said even today. In reading Melville's rather confident statements on zoological subjects, however, one cannot escape the wish that he had sought less to disparage the naturalists of his time and, as he was later to do in his masterful dissertation on the sperm whale, had been willing to rely upon them to a considerably greater extent. He seems, unfortunately, to have made the usual sailor's mistakes in ichthyology and to have accepted a substantial amount of hearsay in place of solid fact.

We may consider, for example, his treatment of the swordfish, to which he devotes the greater portion of a chapter. In doing so, he not only enters into a somewhat elaborate and extensive description but obviously seeks to impress upon his reader what he pretends is a very intimate acquaintance with the species, including its zoological name.

Now, the fish here treated of [he tells us] is a very different creature from the Sword fish frequenting the Northern Atlantic; being much larger every way, and a more dashing varlet to boot. Furthermore, he is denominated the Indian Sword fish, in contradistinction from his namesake above mentioned. But by

¹ *Mardi* (New York, 1849), I, 54.

seamen in the Pacific, he is more commonly known as the Bill fish;² while for those who love science and hard names, be it known, that among the erudite naturalists he goeth by the outlandish appellation of "*Xiphias Platypterus*." (I, 126)

When we examine Melville's knowledge of the species in question, we find it rather less than he would have us believe. His principal error seems to be the confusion of two or three separate species. His "Indian Sword fish," if I am not mistaken, may be identified as that spectacular cousin of the true swordfish, the Indian sailfish (*Istiophorus gladius*), which is quite common in the southern Pacific Ocean and which also carries a spear. When he mentions the case of the piscine sword embedded in the timbers of a whaling ship and offers to prove his tale by sending his reader to a museum in London where the actual relic is preserved for inspection, he no doubt refers to the prowess of the spearfish (genus *Tetrapturus*), another cousin. Melville's willingness to prove the example is the result simply of his having learned of it through Frederick D. Bennett's *Narrative of a Whaling Voyage round the Globe* (London, 1840), one of his favorite source books.³ Even the sword which Melville himself captured was apparently not flattened or oval like that of the true swordfish. "It was three-sided," he says, "slightly concave on each, like a bayonet; and some three inches through at the base, it tapered from thence to a point."⁴ One may infer from this description that either the sailfish or the spearfish had provided Melville with an interesting souvenir; it could hardly have been the swordfish.

To take another example of Melville's ichthyological information, we may examine his delineation of the characteristics of that interesting sucking fish, the remora. At one point in *Mardi* he mentions four or five individuals of this species clinging (as he describes them) to the back of a shark. How and where, one wonders, did Melville derive the idea that the remora rides *upon* the shark? Did he, perhaps, actually see these in the water uppermost of a shark, without recognizing that the shark was turned at the moment on its back or side, the remora attached ventrally? At any rate, Melville certainly did not examine these rather horrifying fish with care. He characterizes them as

snaky parasites, impossible to remove from whatever they adhered to, without destroying their lives. The Remora has little power in swimming; hence its sole locomotion is on the backs of larger fish. Leech-like, it sticketh closer than a false brother in prosperity. . . . But it feeds upon what it clings to; its feelers having a direct communication with the esophagus. (I, 70)

A study of modern descriptions of the remora reveals that this passenger fish almost invariably attaches itself not to the back but rather to

² The "Bill fish" is the modern broadbill.

³ For a discussion of Melville's use of Bennett, see David Jaffé, "Some Sources of Melville's *Mardi*," *AL*, IX (March, 1937), 56-69.

⁴ *Mardi*, I, 128.

the stomach of the shark. Furthermore, it cannot, like the leech, feed upon the blood of its host; the suckers provide a means of transportation only. When feeding grounds have been reached and prey is in sight, the remora detaches itself to gorge, then looks for another complacent finny vehicle. Melville undoubtedly took his information about the remora either from sailors' tales, his own inaccurate observation, or some source like Oliver Goldsmith's *Animated Nature*, with which he was familiar. Goldsmith, with a feeling for the spectacular, flatly declares that "this animal sticks to the shark, and drains away his moisture."⁸

In the thirteenth chapter of *Mardi*, entitled "Of the Chondropterygii, and Other Uncouth Hordes Infesting the South Seas," Melville invokes with seeming lightness the names of the great German naturalists Johannes Müller and Friedrich Henle, authors of a monumental work on the shark.⁹ Where Melville saw or heard of their book is an interesting mystery. What seems clear is that he never read it. I have searched in vain among the periodicals of the time for a review which might have conveyed to Melville his knowledge of Müller and Henle. By his mention of these acknowledged authorities and classifiers of the shark, Melville apparently was attempting to make a display of his erudition and his familiarity with science. Having done so, he next carried the pretense one step farther and prepared his own classification of the sharks. This endeavor turns out to be a rather poor one from a scientific point of view, though not an utter failure artistically. The species he mentions number only six, and his descriptive details are of the most meager kind.

First in his classification is "the ordinary Brown Shark, or sea-attorney, so called by the sailors; a grasping, rapacious varlet. . . . At times, these gentry swim in herds; especially about the remains of a slaughtered whale. They are the vultures of the deep."⁷ There is little enough of a zoological nature here, to be sure. Next he presents "the dandy Blue Shark, a long, taper and mighty genteel looking fellow, with a slender waist, like a Bond-street beau, and the whitest tiers of teeth imaginable. This dainty spark invariably lounged by with a careless fin and an indolent tail. But he looked infernally heartless" (I, 55). I suspect that at this point Melville, in his desire to give the blue shark a certain consistency of character, deliberately overlooked some of the cruder aspects of his behavior. To have said that he prefers a diet of garbage, as is really the case, after speaking of him as a dapper beau would hardly have been compatible with artistic propriety.

⁸ There were numerous editions of this work. The reference may be found in *A History of the Earth, and Animated Nature*, 4 vols. (Philadelphia, 1848), III, 263.

⁹ *Systematische Beschreibung der Plagiostomen* (Berlin, 1838-1841).

⁷ *Mardi*, I, 55. Bennett mentions (I, 165) that the sharks in Polynesian waters "are chiefly of the brown species (*Squalus carcharias*), which frequents the ocean generally."

ties. His classification suffers throughout, I think, by his determination to achieve literary effectiveness. As a result, he attributes a number of the blue shark's habits exclusively to the tiger shark. This latter marauding savage he describes as "a round, portly gourmand; with distended mouth and collapsed conscience, swimming about seeking whom he might devour. These gluttons are the scavengers of navies, following ships in the South Seas, picking up odds and ends of garbage, and sometimes a tit-bit, a stray sailor" (I, 56).

If the foregoing portion of his classification involves a certain amount of confusion and minor deviation from scientific accuracy, what follows is even more confused; or at least it is harder to decipher. I am unable to say exactly what species Melville meant by his "Bone Shark." It may be what we know as the basking shark or even the zebra shark, not to mention the remote possibility of its being the whale shark. He describes it in these words: "Full as large as a whale, it is spotted like a leopard; and tusk-like teeth overlap its jaws like those of the walrus" (I, 55). In the basking shark, as in several other members of the shark family, the snout overhangs the mouth to produce a tusk-like effect, but the teeth are comparatively small. The zebra shark, known chiefly in Oriental waters, has dark, leopard-like spots on a yellowish-brown body; and a pair of long teeth, one over each side of the jaw, give it a walrus-like appearance. It fails, however, to meet Melville's requirement as to size; for it seldom exceeds a length of six or seven feet.

Other specimens described by Melville are easier to identify. One, he says, "evermore, like a surly lord, only goes abroad attended by his suite. It is the Shovel-nosed Shark. A clumsy lethargic monster, unshapely as his name . . ." (I, 69). If this is what it seems to be, one of the remarkable hammerhead sharks, Melville may indeed call it a monster. The shovelhead or bonnet shark has a wide, unbelievably grotesque head and, like others of this lordly race, frequently goes escorted by the pilot fish or is a complaisant host of the sucking fish. But its appearance, frightful as it may be, arouses occasional mirth; whereas its cousin the white shark, notorious as a man eater, inspires only awe and fear. "This ghost of a fish," Melville declares, "is not often encountered, and shows plainer by night than by day. Timon-like, he always swims by himself; gliding along just under the surface, revealing a long, vague shape, of a milky hue; with glimpses now and then of his bottomless white pit of teeth" (I, 57).

If we are to conclude anything from these descriptions with regard to Melville's competence in the elasmobranch part of ichthyology, it is only, I think, that he had become aware of scientific classification as a method in zoology and that he was interested in the immense variety of species existing under the seas. Elsewhere in *Mardi* we find mention of the devilfish and other odd forms, as well as a very frank admiration for that "mysterious federation subsisting among the mol-

lusca of the Tunicata order," a type of cuttlefish living in what is called a compound structure; "though connected by membranous canals, freely communicating throughout the league—each member has a heart and stomach of its own; provides and digests its own dinners. . . . But if a prowling shark touches one member, it ruffles all" (II, 249-50).

Melville makes an interesting attempt—and one which is not entirely unsuccessful—to explain the phosphorescence of sea water in some parts of the Pacific. In advancing his explanation, however, Melville cannot resist the temptation to strike an unwarranted blow at the great Michael Faraday; presumably he does this as the result of exuberance or in the hope of impressing his reader.

Faraday might, perhaps, impute the phenomenon [remarks Melville] to a peculiarly electrical condition of the atmosphere; and to that solely. But herein, my scientific friend would be stoutly contradicted by many intelligent seamen, who, in part, impute it to the presence of large quantities of putrescent animal matter, with which the sea is well known to abound.

And it would seem not unreasonable to suppose, that it is by this means that the fluid itself becomes charged with the luminous principle. Draw a bucket of water from the phosphorescent ocean, and it still retains traces of fire; but, standing awhile, this soon subsides. Now pour it along the deck, and it is a stream of flame; caused by its renewed agitation. Empty the bucket, and for a space sparkles cling to it tenaciously; and every stave seems ignited.

But after all, this seeming ignition of the sea can not be wholly produced by dead matter therein. There are many living fish, phosphorescent; and, under certain conditions, by a rapid throwing off of luminous particles must largely contribute to the result. . . . [T]he myriads of microscopic mollusca, well known to swarm off soundings, might alone be deemed almost sufficient to kindle a fire in the brine.

But these are only surmises; likely, but uncertain. (I, 148-49)

Why Melville should have brought Faraday into the discussion, unless because of his general connection with the study of electricity, is rather difficult to see. The theory regarding phosphorescence, of course, was very probably derived from the suggestions made by Frederick Bennett, who sacrifices literary art but comes directly to the point in his exposition of the matter:

Many opinions have been at different times entertained upon the cause of a luminous state of the ocean; some have supposed it to depend upon a peculiar electrical condition of the atmosphere, or the presence of decomposed animal matter, which we may reasonably suppose is plentifully diffused in sea-water; whilst others have attributed this effect to the luminous power possessed by living marine animals.⁸

There is also a slight possibility that Melville, while writing *Mardi*, may have seen Darwin's *Journal of Researches* (1839), in which the following comment appears: "I have sometimes imagined that a

⁸ *Op. cit.*, II, 319.

disturbed electrical condition of the atmosphere was most favorable to the production of phosphorescent seas."⁹ To be sure, most of the South Seas travel books to which Melville had access described the phenomenon and advanced theories to explain it.

Melville, too, had the courage to advance theories; but it was largely the courage of ignorance. As ichthyologist, he must remain very definitely in the ranks of the amateurs. Though he was later, in *Moby-Dick*, to show a surprising mastery of cetological information, in the trial period of *Mardi* he seems to have relied upon reading restricted to semi-scientific works like those of Bennett and other travel writers as well as upon his own experiences and sailors' tales for his zoological facts. Thus he fell into inevitable errors and inaccuracies. Like most of his contemporaries, he seems not at this point to have been aware of the real nature of the scientific movement which was developing during the nineteenth century. Here and there in *Mardi*, however, there does break through a description or an idea which faintly foreshadows the Darwinism of later years. Perhaps one of these may be detected in Melville's pity for the struggling bonetta, tangled hopelessly in sea kelp, which is quickly deserted by its remorseless fellows—a victim of nature's relentless laws. Every fish for itself in the battle for survival. "The myriad fins swim on; a lonely waste, where the last one drops behind."¹⁰ While the thought here is only in the germ and has not yet ripened even to greenness, it may well mark the beginning of Melville's real scientific awareness. The splendors of *Moby-Dick* undoubtedly had their origins in the fertilizing slime of the *Mardi* experiment.

Mitchell College

⁹ See Charles Darwin, *Journal of Researches into the Natural History and Geology of the Countries Visited during the Voyage of H. M. S. Beagle* (New York, 1899), p. 160.

¹⁰ *Mardi*, I, 178.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CRITICAL ARTHURIAN LITERATURE FOR THE YEAR 1950

Prepared by

JOHN J. PARRY*

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| <i>AHR</i> | American Historical Review |
| <i>Ann. de Bret.</i> | Annales de Bretagne |
| <i>Beiträge</i> | Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur |
| <i>BBCS</i> | Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies |
| <i>BBSIA</i> | Bulletin Bibliographique de la Société Internationale Arthurienne |
| <i>CFMA</i> | Classiques Française du Moyen Age |
| <i>Comp. Lit.</i> | Comparative Literature |
| <i>Cult. Neolat.</i> | Cultura Neolatina |
| <i>Deu. Viertel.</i> | Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte |
| <i>ELH</i> | English Literary History |
| <i>Et. Celt.</i> | Etudes Celtiques |
| <i>Et. Germ.</i> | Etudes Germaniques |
| <i>Fr. St.</i> | French Studies |
| <i>Ger. Rev.</i> | Germanic Review |
| <i>Hist.</i> | History |
| <i>Hist. Zeit.</i> | Historische Zeitschrift |
| <i>Hispan. Rev.</i> | Hispanic Review |
| <i>JEGP</i> | Journal of English and Germanic Philology |
| <i>Let. Rom.</i> | Les Lettres Romanes |
| <i>LTLS</i> | London Times Literary Supplement |
| <i>Lumière du Graal</i> | René Nelli (editor). <i>Lumière du Graal</i> . Paris: Editions des Cahiers du Sud, 1950. |
| <i>MA</i> | Moyen Age |
| <i>Med. et Hum.</i> | Mediaevalia et Humanistica |
| <i>Mélanges Hœpffner</i> | Mélanges de philologie romane et de littérature médiévale offerts à Ernest Hœpffner |
| <i>Mélanges Roques</i> | Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature romanes offerts à Mario Roques. 2 vols. Bade: Editions art et science, & Paris: Marcel Didier, 1950. |
| <i>Microfilm Abstracts</i> | Microfilm Abstracts. (A Collection of Abstracts of Doctoral Dissertations and Monographs Available in Complete Form on Microfilm.) Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Vol. XI, 1951. |
| <i>MLN</i> | Modern Language Notes |
| <i>MLQ</i> | Modern Language Quarterly |
| <i>MLR</i> | Modern Language Review |
| <i>MP</i> | Modern Philology |
| <i>Neophil.</i> | Neophilologus |

* For the sake of completeness a number of items which I had overlooked are here added from the *Bulletin Bibliographique* (see item 3093) of the International Arthurian Society. They are designated by their BB numbers.

- Neuphil. Mit.* Neuphilologische Mitteilungen
N&Q Notes and Queries
Panzer Studien Richard Kienast (editor). Studien zur deutschen Philologie des Mittelalters Friedrich Panzer zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. September 1950 dargebracht. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1950.
- PMLA* Publications of the Modern Language Association of America
RES Review of English Studies, New Series
Rev. Belge Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire
RF Romanische Forschungen
RFE Revista de Filología Española
RHE Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique
RLM Revista di Letterature Moderne
Rom. Romania
Rom. Phil. Romance Philology
RR Romanic Review
SP Studies in Philology
W. M. Day Studies Romance Studies Presented to William Morton Day. (University of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures, XII.) Chapel Hill, 1950.
- ZDA* Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur
3173. Ackerman, Robert W. "[American] Bibliography for 1949." *BBSIA*, II (1950), 26-36.
3174. Adler, Alfred. "A Note on the Composition of Chrétien's 'Charrette.'" *MLR*, XLV (1950), 33-39.
3175. ———. "Problems of Aesthetic versus Historical Criticism in *La Morte le Roi Artu*." *PMLA*, LXV (1950), 930-943.
- 3175a. Adolf, Helen. "The Theological and Feudal Background of Wolfram's *suivel* (P, 1, 1)." *JEGP*, XLIX (1950), 285-303.
3176. Albert, Peter P. *Die "Gralsburg" Wildenberg im Odenwald und die historische Kritik*. Ein Tatsachenbericht. (Als MS. gedruckt.) Buchen: Wittemann, 1949.
3177. Altick, Richard D. "The Quest of the Knight Prisoner." (Malory.) Pp. 65-85 in *The Scholar Adventurers*. New York: Macmillan, 1950.
3178. Anderson, George K. (and others). *A History of English Literature*. (Arthurian material *passim*.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.
3179. Archer, Jerome W. "On Chaucer's Source for 'Arveragus' in the *Franklin's Tale*." (Geoffrey's *Historia*.) *PMLA*, LXV (1950), 318-322.
3180. Arese, Felice (editor). *Prose di romanzi: Il Romanzo cortese in Italia nei secoli XIII e XIV*. Torino: U.T.E.T., 1950.
2754. Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis*. 1946.
 Additional reviews by Delio Cantimori in *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere, Storia e Filosofia*, II, xv, 1946 (1947), 222-223;

by Ludwig Edelstein in *MLN*, LXV (1950), 426-431; by Roland Mortier in *Rev. Belge*, xxviii (1950), 189-192; see also F. Schalk.

3181. Bäumer, Gertrude. *Die drei göttlichen Komödien des Abendlandes, Wolframs Parsifal, Dantes Divina Commedia, Goethes Faust*. Münster: Regensburg, 1949. (BB 9)

3182. Baldensperger, Fernand, and Werner P. Friederich. "Celtic and Arthurian Contributions." Pp. 381-390 in *Bibliography of Comparative Literature*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1950.

Ballard, Jean. See René Nelli.

3183. Battle, Guy A. "Heine's *Geoffroy Rudel und Melisande von Tripoli* and Arnold's *Tristram and Iseult* and *The Church of Brou*." *MLN*, LXV (1950), 466-467.

3184. Baughan, Denver Ewing. "The Role of Morgan le Fay in 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight.'" *ELH*, xvii (1950), 241-251.

3185. Beattie, William (editor). *The Chepman and Myllar Prints. Nine Tracts from the first Scottish Press, Edinburgh 1508. . . . A Facsimile with a bibliographical note*. (Includes *Golagrus and Gawain*.) Edinburgh: Bibliographical Society, 1950.

Rev. in *LTLS*, May 26, 1950, p. 332; by Curt F. Bühler in *Renaissance News*, iii (1950), 45-47.

3186. Bell, Alexander. "Gaimar's Early 'Danish' Kings." (Includes Geoffrey of Monmouth.) *PMLA*, LXV (1950), 601-640.

2838. Bezzola, Reto R. *Le sens de l'aventure et de l'amour*. 1947. Additional rev. by Mariette Held in *Cult. Neolat.*, ix (1949), 179-183.

2940. Binni, Walter. *Metodo e poesia di Ludovico Ariosto*. 1947. Rev. by R. Van Neuffel in *Rev. Belge*, xxviii (1950), 196-197.

3187. Blenner-Hassett, Roland. *A Study of the Place-Names in Lawman's "Brut"*. (Stanford University Publications, Language and Literature, Volume IX, Number 1.) Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1950.

Rev. by Edward C. Ehrensperger in *JEGP*, L (1951), 116.

3070. Bohigas, P. *Tractats de cavalleria*. 1947.

Rev. by V. Lloréns in *Hisp. Rev.*, xviii (1950), 267-268.

3188. Bolelli, Tristano. "Le leggenda del re dalle orecchie di cavallo in Irlanda." In *Due studi irlandesi*. Pisa: Libr. Goliardica, 1950.

3189. Brereton, Georgine E. "A Thirteenth Century List of French Lays and Other Narrative Poems." *MLR*, xlv (1950), 40-45.

3190. Brown, Paul A. "The Arthurian Legends: Supplement to Northup and Parry's Annotated Bibliography." With further supplement by John J. Parry. *JEGP*, xlix (1950), 208-216.

3190a. Brown, Theo. "A Note on Gog." (Geoffrey of Monmouth.) *Folk-Lore*, lxi (1950), 98-103.

3191. Brummer, Rudolf. *Die erzählende Prosadichtung in den romanischen Literaturen des XIII. Jahrhunderts*. 1. Band. (Robert de Boron, *Lancelot-Graal*.) Berlin: Stundenglasverlag, 1948. (BB 10 bis)

2444a. Brunel, Clovis. *Jaufre, conte de la Table Ronde*. Neuchâtel: La Baconnière, 1949.

An adaptation of the text published in 1943 by SATF. See Y. R. in *RHE*, xlv (1950), 374.

3192. Buraud, Georges. "La Quête du Graal dans le littérature et l'art modernes." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 289-314.

3193. Carman, J. Neale. "Was Pelles the Fisher King?" *Rom. Phil.*, III (1950), 272-275.

3071. Casson, L. F. *The Romance of Sir Degrevant*. 1949.

Rev. by Angus McIntosh in *RES*, II (1951), 68-71.

3193a. Castelnau, Jacques. *La Vie au Moyen Age d'après les contemporains*. (Chapter IV includes courtly romances.) Paris: Hachette, 1949.

Rev. by Giuseppe F. Sansone in *Cult. Neolat.*, x (1950), 103-106.

3194. Clark, John W. "Paraphrases for 'God' in the Poems Attributed to 'The Gawain-Poet.'" *MLN*, LXV (1950), 232-236.

3195. ———. "The Gawain-Poet' and the Substantival Adjective." *JEGP*, XLIX (1950), 60-66.

3196. Closs, Hannah. "Convergence des Sources [du Graal]." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 50-70.

3073b. Cohen, Gustave. *Histoire de la chevalerie en France au Moyen Age*. (Includes *Yvain*, *Conte del Graal*, etc.) Paris: Richard-Massé, 1949.

Brief rev. by Y.R. in *RHE*, xlv (1950), 373; by J.P. in *RLR*, LXX (1951, for 1950), 282.

3074a. Curtius, Ernest Robert. *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern: 1948.

Rev. by r m r [Ruggieri M. Ruggiero] in *Cult. Neolat.*, ix (1949), 230-231; by Kurt Sulger in *RR*, xli (1950), 208-211; by Jean G. Præaux in *Latomus*, ix (1950), 99-102; by Reto R. Bezzola in *Erasmus*, III (1950), 692-696; by Friedrich Panzer in *Hist. Zeit.*, CLXX (1950), 109-115; by Arno Schirokauer in *JEGP*, XLIX (1950), 395-399; by Erich Auerbach in *RF*, LXII (1950), 239-245; by Max Wehrli in *ADA*, LXIV (1950), 84-91; by Paul Zumthor in *ZPPH*, LXVI (1950), 150-169.

3197. D., A. "Some Notes on 'The Waste Land.'" (Brief reference to Parzival and Grail.) *N&Q*, cxcv (August 19, 1950), 365-369.

3198. Decahors, Elie. *Histoire de la littérature française*. T. I. Le Moyen Age. Paris: Editions de l'Ecole, 1949.

3199. Dichmann, Mary E. "Characterization in Malory's *Tale of Arthur and Lucius*." *PMLA*, LXV (1950), 877-895.

3200. Donaldson, E. Talbot. "Malory and the Stanzaic *Le Morte Arthur*." *SP*, XLVII (1950), 460-472.

3201. Draak, A. M. E. "[Netherlands] Arthurian Bibliography, 1949." *BBSIA*, II (1950), 58-59.

3202. Eggers, Hans. "Literarische Beziehungen des Parzival zum Tristrant Eilharts von Oberge." *Beiträge*, LXXII (1950), 39-51.

3084a. Errante, Guido. *Marcabru e le fonti sacri dell' antica lirica romansa*. 1948.

Rev. by T. G. Bergin in *RR*, XLI (1950), 211-213; by W. Theodor Elwert in *RF*, LXII (1950), 249-250.

3202a. Finlay, Sister Mary Germaine. *Joseph of Arimathea and the Grail*. (Columbia diss., 1950.) *Microfilm Abstracts*, XI (1951), 110-112.

3202b. Fleck, H. C. "The Story of Parsifal." *Etude*, LXVIII (April, 1950), 9-11.

3087. Flutre, L.-F. "Etudes sur le Roman de *Perceforêt*." (Continued.) *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 374-392, 482-508.

3203. Foerster, Lilian E. "Vengeance for Morold." (From Gottfried von Strassburg.) *Opera News*, xv, 7 (December 4, 1950), 12-15.

3204. Fotitch, Tatiana. *The Narrative Tenses in Chrétien de Troyes: A Study in Syntax and Stylistics*. (Catholic Univ. St. in Rom. Langs. and Lit., XXXVIII.) Catholic University of America diss., 1950.

2967. Foulet, Lucien. *Chrétien de Troyes, Perceval le Gallois ou le Conte du Graal mis en français moderne*. Paris: Editions Stock [1949].

Rev. by William A. Nitze in *Speculum*, xxv (1950), 559-561.

3205. Foulon, C., and J. Frappier. "Bibliographie française." *BBSIA*, II (1950), 37-52.

3206. Fourquet, Jean. "L'Ancien et le nouveau Titurel (avec traductions)." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 230-262.

3207. Fourrier, Anthime. "Encore la chronologie des œuvres de Chrétien de Troyes." *BBSIA*, II (1950), 69-88.

3208. Francis, E. A. "Guillaume d'Angleterre." (Includes Arthurian material.) Pp. 63-76 in *Studies in French Language, Literature and History presented to R. L. Graeme Ritchie*. Cambridge: University Press, 1949.

3209. ————. "Note sur un terme employé par Wace avec quelques observations sur la chronologie de ses œuvres." *Mélanges Roques*.

3210. Françon, M. "La fée Morgain et Ronsard." *Rom. Phil.*, II (1948-49), 239-240.

3093. Frappier, Jean (editor). *Bulletin Bibliographique de la Société Internationale Arthurienne*. (Contains list of members.) No. 2. Paris [1950].

3211. ————. "Sur l'interprétation du vers 3301 du Conte du Graal. 'Le graal trestot desouvert.'" *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 240-245. "Note additionnelle," by Mario Roques, *ibid.*, 245-246.

3212. ————. "Autres remarques sur le vers 3301 du Conte du Graal." *BBSIA*, II (1950), 89-93.

3213. ————. "Le cortège du Graal." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 175-224.

3214. F[rappier], J. "Un nouveau manuscrit de la *Mort Artu*." *BBSIA*, II (1950), 95-96.

———. See also C. Foulon.

Friederich, Werner P. See Fernand Baldensperger.

3093c. Frings, Theodor. *Minnesinger und Troubadours*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1949.

Rev. by Erich Auerbach in *Rom. Phil.*, IV (1950), 65-67.

3215. Führer, Irmgard, Wilhelm Kellermann, and Stefan Hofer. "Allemagne et Autriche: Bibliographie arthurienne pour les années 1939-1949." *BBSIA*, II (1950), 11-25.

3216. Gilbert, Max. *Notes complémentaires aux études sur la Charte aux Normands, les dieux normands et le Roi Arthur*. Fécamp: L. Durand et Fils, 1949. (BB 140)

3216a. Gildea, Joseph James. "A Study of the Old French Arthurian Romance *Durmart le Galois*." *Microfilm Abstracts*, IX (1949), 123-124.

3216b. Greene, Marion A. "A Note on the Word *fauve* in Old French." (Meaning in *Conte del Graal*.) *W. M. Day Studies*, pp. 75-77.

3098. Groult, P., and V. Emond. *Anthologie de la littérature française du moyen âge*. 1948. Second edition, Gembloux: Duculot [1950?].

Rev. by Yves Ricaud in *RHE*, XLV (1950), 259-261; by E. C. van Bellen in *Rev. Belge*, XXVIII (1950), 800-802; by J. Engels in *Neophil.*, XXXIV (1950), 116-117; by Pierre David in *Revista Portuguesa de Filologia*, III (1949-50), 297-298.

3217. Guénon, René. "L'esotérisme du Graal." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 37-49.

3218. Hatcher, Anna Granville. "Lai du *Chievrefueil*, 61-78; 107-13." *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 330-344.

3218a. Heather, P. J. "Color Symbolism." (Many Arthurian examples.) *Folk-Lore*, LIX (1948), 165-183; LX (1949), 208-216, 266-276, 317-333.

3219. Höfler, Otto. "Ulrichs von Liechtenstein Venusfahrt und Artusfahrt." *Panzer Studien*, pp. 131-152.

1093. Hæpffner, E. "*La Folie Tristan*" de Berne. Commentaire de E. Hæpffner. 1934. Second edition, revue et corrigée. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949.

Rev. by R. Bossuat in *MA*, LVI (1950), 386-388; by K. Sneyders de Vogel in *Neophil.*, xxxv (1951), 57-58; by Arthur Långfors in *Neophil. Mit.*, LI (1950), 198-199.

3220. ————. "Estoire dou Graal de Robert de Boron." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 139-150.

Hæpffner, Mélanges. 1949.

Rev. by Mario Roques in *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 262-267.

Hofer, Stefan. See Irmgard Führer.

2872. Holmes, Urban T., Jr. "A New Interpretation of Chrétien's *Conte del Graal*." 1948.

Rev. by Jeanne Lods in *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 118-119. See also Raphael Levy.

3221. ————. "The Arthurian Tradition in Lambert d'Ardres." *Speculum*, xxv (1950), 100-103.

3221a. ————. "The Dominican Rite and the Judaeo-Christian Theory of the Grail." *W. M. Day Studies*, pp. 95-98.

Hoog, Armand. See Maurice Wilmotte.

3222. Housman, J. E. "[Great Britain] Arthurian Bibliography, 1949." *BBSIA*, II (1950), 53-57.

3222a. Ivy, Robert H., Jr. "The Manuscript Relations of Manesier's Continuation of the Old French *Perceval*." *Microfilm Abstracts*, ix (1949), 144-145.

———. See William Roach.

3223. Jackson, Isaac. "Gawain and the Green Knight. (A Note on 'fade,' line 149.)" *N&Q*, cxcv (January 21, 1950), 24.

See also G. V. Smithers (3277) and Kenneth Sisam (3275).

3224. Jaretski, Paul. "Tristan's Fourth Dimension." *Opera News*, xv, 7 (December 4, 1950), 26-28.

3225. J[odogne], O. "Chrétien de Troyes." [A brief note.] *Let. Rom.*, iv (1950), 240.

3226. ————. "Encore sur l'origine arabe de la poésie provençale." *Let. Rom.*, iv (1950), 237-238.

3227. Jones, Charles W. "Arthurian Literature." Section V in *Medieval Literature in Translation*. New York: Longmans Green & Co., 1950.

3116b. Joos, Martin, and Frederick R. Whitsell (editors). *Middle High German Courtly Reader*. 1949.

Rev. by Archer Taylor in *JEGP*, XLIX (1950), 394-395.

Kellermann, Wilhelm. See Irmgard Führer.

3228. Kelly, Amy. *Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Four Kings*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Rev. in *Time*, June 12, 1950, pp. 102, 104, 106; by Thomas Caldecot Chubb in *N. Y. Times Book Rev.*, April 30, 1950, p. 3; by A. C. Krey in *AHR*, LVI (1950), 84-87; by Loren C. MacKinney in *Speculum*, xxvi (1951), 166-170.

3229. Kendrick, T. D. *British Antiquity*. (The Arthurian tradition after Geoffrey of Monmouth.) London: Methuen, 1950.

Rev. in *LTLS*, October 6, 1950, p. 632; by O. G. S. Crawford in *Antiquity*, 97 (1951), 9-10.

3230. Kiparsky, V. "Mittelfranz. *Lecto* (für *Letto*) 'Litauen.'" *Neuphil. Mit.*, L (1949), 198-200. See 3151, Prioult, 1949.

3231. Klöckner, Margarete. *Das Verhältnis von Gott und Welt in der Dichtung Hartmanns von Aue*. Bonn diss., Maschinenschrift, 1948. (BB 17)

3232. Knight, F. Jackson. *Cumaeae Gates: A Reference of the Sixth Aeneid to Initiation Pattern*. (Parallels between Grail-quest and Gilgamesh-epic.) Oxford: Blackwell, 1936.

Rev. by Léon Herrmann in *Latomus*, ix (1950), 93-94.

3233. Kuhn, Hugo. "Zum neuen Bild vom Mittelalter." (Curtius, 3074a, etc.) *Deu. Viertel.*, xxiv (1950), 530-544.

3234. Lafitte-Houssat, Jacques. *Troubadours et cours d'amour*. Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1950.

3235. Law, Robert Adger. "Holinshed's Leir Story and Shakespeare's." (Includes *Brut or Chronicle of England*.) *SP*, XLVII (1950), 42-50.

Leach, Mac Edward. See Roger Sherman Loomis.

3236. van der Lee, Anthony. *Der Stil von Hartmanns Erec verglichen mit dem älteren Epik*. (Utrecht diss., 1950.) Utrecht: Drukkerij H. J. Smits [1950].

Rev. by John Lancaster Riordan in *JEGP*, L (1951), 251-252.

3237. Legge, M. Dominica. "Toothache and Courtly Love." *Fr. St.*, iv (1950), 50-54.

3238. ———. "Some Notes on the Roman de Fergus." *Trans. of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Soc.*, xxvii (1950?), 163-172.

3239. Le Hir, Y. "L'Elément biblique dans la Quête du Saint Graal." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 101-112.

300i. Lethbridge, T. C. *Merlin's Island*. 1948.

Rev. by J. N. L. Myres in *History*, xxxv (1950), 110-111.

3240. Levi-Provençal, E. "Poésie arabe d'Espagne et poésie d'Europe médiévale." In *Islam d'Occident, Etudes d'histoire médiévale*. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1948.

Rev. by A. R. Nykl in *Speculum*, xxvi (1951), 179-184.

3241. Levy, Raphael. "The Quest for Biographical Evidence in *Perceval*." (Comment on Holmes, 2872.) *Med. et Hum.*, vi (1950), 76-83.

3241a. Lewis, Robert G. "A Comic Enchantment in the *Perceforest*." *W. M. Day Studies*, pp. 125-127.

3005. Loomis, Roger Sherman. *Introduction to Medieval Literature*, 1948.

Rev. by Francis Lee Utley in *MLQ*, xi (1950), 498-499.

3123. ————. *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes*. 1949.

Rev. by Robert W. Ackerman in *JEGP*, xlix (1950), 245-247; by A. Ewert in *Fr. St.*, iv (1950), 261-263; by John E. Housman in *RES*, i (1950), 358-360; by Howard R. Patch in *Rom. Phil.*, iii (1950), 310-317; by Lawton P. G. Peckham in *RR*, xli (1950), 214-216; by M. O'C. Walshe in *Erasmus*, iii (1950), 643-648; by Alfred Adler in *Symposium*, iv (1950), 417-422; by Thomas Jones in *Llên Cymru*, i (1950), 126-129; by Mary Williams in *MLR*, xlv (1950), 546-548; by Jean Frappier in *Rom.*, lxxii (1951), 118-127.

3242. ————. "Le Folklore breton et les romans arthuriens." *Ann. de Bret.*, lvi (1949), 203-227. An English version, "Breton Folklore and Arthurian Romance," appeared in *Comp. Lit.*, ii (1950), 289-306.

3124. ————. "Lancelot," 602; "Mabinogion," 658-659; "Merlin," 708-709; "Mordred or Modred," 746; "Morgan le Fay," 746-747; "Percival or Perceval," 856; "Tristan, Tristram, or Tristrem" (with Mac Edward Leach), 1125-1126; "Vivien or Vivian," 1161. *Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology, and Legend*. Vol. II. New York: Funk and Wagnalls [1950].

3243. Lot-Borodine, Myrrha. "Le symbolisme du Graal dans l'*Estoire del Saint-Graal*." *Neophil.*, xxxiv (1950), 65-79.

3244. ————. "Les grands secrets du Saint-Graal dans la *Queste du pseudo-Map*." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 151-174.

3245. Luxenburger, Maria. *Die Zeitgestaltung in Wolfram von Eschenbachs "Parzival"*. Bonn diss., Maschinenschrift, 1949. (BB 19)

3246. Lyons, F. "La fausse morte dans le Cligès de Chrétien de Troyes." *Mélanges Roques*, i, 187 ff. (?).

3247. MacCulloch, J. A. *The Celtic and Scandinavian Religions*. London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1950.

Rev. in *LTLS*, March 31, 1950, p. 205; by F. Benoit in *Latomus*, ix (1950), 501.

3247a. McShane, Mother Edith E. *Tudor Opinions of the Chivalrous Romance: An Essay in the History of Criticism*. Catholic University diss., 1950. (Not published?)

Martin de Riquer. See Riquer, Martín de.

3248. Marx, Jean. "Le héros du Graal." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 90-100.

3249. Maurer, Friedrich. "Parzivals Sünden, Erwägungen zur Frage nach Parzivals 'Schuld.'" *Deu. Viertel.*, xxiv (1950), 304-346.

3129. ————. "Zum ritterlichen 'Tugendsystem.'" (Continued. References to *Erek* and *Parzival*.) *Deu. Viertel.*, xxiv (1950), 526-529.

3250. Menendez Pidal, R. *Poesia araba e poesia europea ed altri saggi*. (See 2057, 1938.) Trad. di E. Ruggiero. 1949.

3251. Mergell, Bodo. *Tristan und Isolde: Ursprung und Entwicklung der Tristansage des Mittelalters*. Mainz: Verlag Kirchheim, 1949.

Rev. by André Moret in *Et. Germ.*, v (1950), 188; by E. H. Zeydel in *MLN*, lxxvi (1951), 194-195.

3252. Micha, A. "Sur les sources de la 'Charette.'" *Rom.*, lxxi (1950), 345-358.

3253. ————. "Les romans du Graal," 113-121; "Le Perceval de Chrétien de Troyes," 122-131; "Première visite de Perceval," 132-138; "Bibliographie sommaire," 328 ff. *Lumière du Graal*.

3253a. Milnes, Humphrey N. *Ueber die erotische Sprache der mittelhochdeutschen höfischen Dichtung*. Ohio State University diss., 1950. (Not published?)

3254. Monteverdi, Angelo. *La poesia lirica provenzale*. Roma: Ateneo, 1949.

3134. Moret, André. *Anthologie du Minnesang*. 1949.

Rev. by J.H.S. in *Neophil.*, xxxiv (1950), 121; by Carl Hammer, Jr., in *Ger. Rev.*, xxvi (1951), 144-145.

3255. Neinhart, Anneliese. *Die epische Szene in der höfischen Dichtung: Ein Vergleich von Hartmanns "Iwein" und Wolframs "Parzival"*. Göttingen diss., Maschinenschrift, 1948. (BB 25)

3256. Nelli, René (editor). *Lumière du Graal*. Avant-propos by Jean Ballard. (Contributors are listed under their own names.) Paris: Editions des Cahiers du Sud [1950?].

3257. ————. "Le Graal dans l'ethnographie," 13-36; "Le Graal visible et les chercheurs de la pensée mythique: Mythes modernes et actualité du Graal," 315-323. *Lumière du Graal*.

3258. Neumann, Friedrich. "Wann dichtete Hartmann von Aue?" *Panzer Studien*, pp. 59-72.

2900. Newstead, Helaine. *The Grail Legend and Celtic Tradition*. 1945.

Rev. by Jeanne Lods in *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 143-144.

3259. ———. "Kaherdin and the Enchanted Pillow: An Episode in the Tristan Legend." *PMLA*, LXV (1950), 290-312.

3259a. ———. *News Letter*. Comparative Literature III (Arthurian Romances) Section of the Modern Language Association. New York: mimeographed, 1950.

3260. Nitze, William A. "Additional Note on Arthurian Names." *PMLA*, LXV (1950), 1287-1288.

2806. Nykl, A. R. *Hispano-Arabic Poetry*. 1946.

Rev. by G. J. Geers in *Neophil.*, xxxiv (1950), 115-116.

3261. Olmedo, F. G. *El "Amadís" y el "Quijote"*. Madrid: Edit. Nacional, 1947.

3262. Ong, Walter J. "The Green Knight's Harts and Bucks." *MLN*, LXV (1950), 536-539.

See comment by Henry L. Savage in *MLN*, LXVI (1951), 216.

3263. Panzer, Friedrich. *Von mittelalterlichen Zitieren*. (Includes *Parsival* and *Iwein*.) Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1950.

3264. Parry, John J. "A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Year 1949." *MLQ*, XI (1950), 217-236.

———. See also Paul A. Brown.

3265. Patch, Howard Rollin. *The Other World According to Descriptions in Medieval Literature*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Rev. by Knut Liestøl in *JEGP*, L (1951), 262-263.

462. Pauphilet, Albert. *La Queste del Saint Graal, roman du XIII^e siècle*. (Photographic reprint of CFMA 33, 1923.) Paris: Champion, 1949. (BB 136)

463. ———. *La Queste du Saint Graal traduite des manuscrits du XIII^e siècle*. Melun: d'Argences, 1949. (A reprint of the translation published in 1925.)

Brief rev. by Y.R. in *RHE*, XLV (1950), 373.

3266. ———. *Le Legs du Moyen Age: Etudes de littérature médiévale*. Chapter IV, "Tristan"; V, "Chrétien de Troyes"; VI, "Perceval et le Graal"; Appendice II, "Sur la composition du Lancelot-Graal." Melun: d'Argences, 1950.

Rev. by Yves Ricaud in *RHE*, XLV (1950), 259-261; by Mario Roques in *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 267-269; by i f in *Cult. Neolat.*, x (1950), 117-118.

3022a. Pellegrini, Silvio. *Intorno al vassallaggio d'amore dei primi trovatori*. Genova: Cultura e Vita, 1948.

Rev. by e p v [Vuolo] in *Cult. Neolat.*, ix (1949), 232.

3267. Place, Edwin B. "The Amadis Question." *Speculum*, xxv (1950), 357-366.

2910. Pons, E. *Sire Gauvain et le Chevalier Vert*. 1946.

Additional rev. by John E. Housman in *Erasmus*, III (1950), 377-380.

3268. Ranke, Friedrich. "Wolfram d'Eschenbach." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 225-229.

3028. Reed, T. Dayrell. *The Rise of Wessex*. 1947.

Rev. by J. N. L. Myres in *Hist.*, xxxiv (1949), 265-266.

3269. Renouard, Y. "L'Ordre de la Jarretière et l'Ordre de l'Etoile." (The Order of the Round Table, 1344.) *MA*, LV (1949), 281-300.

3031. Richards, Melville. *Breudwyf Ronabwy*. 1948.

Rev. by J. Vendryes in *Et. Celt.*, v (1950), 226-229.

3270. Rigaud, L. "Naissance du Graal en Angleterre," 87-89, and "Le Graal au service de la morale victorienne," 282-288. *Lumière du Graal*.

3271. de Riquer, M. *Introduccio al "Tirant lo Blanc"*. Barcelona, 1947.

Rev. by R. Lavaud in *Rom.*, LXX (1948-49), 412-419.

3157. ———. *La lirica de los trovadores*. 1948.

Rev. by René Lavaud in *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 115-116; by Orestes Frattoni in *Filologia* (Buenos Aires), I (1949), 91-93.

3158. Roach, William. *Continuations of the Old French Perceval of Chrétien de Troyes*. 1949. The second volume, by Roach and R. H. Ivy, Jr. (dealing with MSS. E, M, Q, and V), was published by the University of Pennsylvania in 1950.

Vol. I was rev. by Mary Williams in *Fr. St.*, iv (1950), 157-158; by Istvan Frank in *MA*, LVI (1950), 389-392; by Jean Misrahi in *RR*, XLII (1951), 55-60; Vols. I and II by M. Roques in *Rom.*, LXXI (1950); II in *LTLS*, February 23, 1951, p. 119.

3272. Rompelman, T. A. "Zu Walther 79.33." (And Wolfram.) *Neophil.*, xxxiv (1950), 15-20.

Roques, Mario. See Jean Frappier, 3211.

Ruggiero, E. See R. Menendez Pidal, 3250.

3272a. Scanlan, Mary H. "The Legend of King Arthur's Survival." *Microfilm Abstracts*, x (1950), 230-231.

3273. Schalk, F. "Erich Auerbach's 'Mimesis.'" (See 2754.) *Deu. Viertel.*, xxiv (1950), 281-285.

3274. Schneider, Hermann. "Weltliteratur und Nationalliteratur im Mittelalter." *Euphorion*, XLV (1950), 131-139.

3168. Shaw, J. E. *Guido Cavalcanti's Theory of Love*. 1949.

Rev. by Thomas G. Bergin in *RR*, xli (1950), 277-281; by Edward Williamson in *MLN*, lxxv (1950), 549-551.

3169a. Singleton, Charles S. *An Essay on the Vita Nuova*. 1949.

Rev. by Erich Auerbach in *Comp. Lit.*, ii (1950), 373-375; by Angeline H. Lograsso in *Italica*, xxviii (1951), 62-65; by Dino Bigongiari in *RR*, xl (1949), 285-288; by G. C. Walsh in *Thought*, xxiv (1949); by K. Foster in *The Month*, ii (1949), 350-352.

3275. Sisam, Kenneth. "Sir Gawain; lines 147-150." (Meaning of "fade.") (See Isaac Jackson and G. V. Smithers.) *N&Q*, cxcv (May 27, 1950), 239.

3276. [Sisson, Charles J.] "Editorial Note: The International Arthurian Society." *MLR*, xlv (1950), 359.

3277. Smithers, G. V. "A Crux in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight." (See Isaac Jackson and Kenneth Sisam.) *N&Q*, cxcv (April 1, 1950), 134-136.

2921. Soprano, Edoardo (translator). *Il romanzo di Tristano e Isotta*. New edition. Roma: de Carlo, 1946.

Rev. by s p [Silvio Pellegrini] in *RLM*, i (1950), 76-77.

3278. Southward, E. "The Unity of Chrétien's Lancelot." *Mélanges Roques*.

3279. Springer, Otto. "The 'Ane Stegreif' Motif in Medieval Literature." (Hartmann, Wolfram, Krone, etc.) *Ger. Rev.*, xxv (1950), 163-177.

3280. Tatlock, J. S. P. *The Legendary History of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britanniae and its Early Vernacular Versions*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1950.

Rev. by G. H. Gerould in *Speculum*, xxvi (1951), 222-224; by Tom Peete Cross in *MP*, xlviii (1951), 211-214; by John J. Parry in *JEGP*, l (1951), 111-116; by Roger Sherman Loomis in *RR*, xlii (1951), 150-153; by Helaine Newstead in *Latomus*, x (1951), 52-59; by Kemp Malone in *MLN*, lxxvi (1951), 332-335.

3281. Taylor, Archer. "'Or est Venuz Qui Aunera' and the English Proverbial Phrase 'To take his Measure.'" *MLN*, lxxv (1950), 344-345.

3282. Thorpe, Lewis. *Le Roman de Laurin Fils de Marques le Sénéchal: A first contribution to the study of the linguistics of an unpublished Thirteenth Century Prose Romance*. (Comparison with later Arthurian romance.) (University of Nottingham Research Publication No. 1.) Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1950.

3283. Valverde, José Filgueira. "Don Quijote e el Amor Trovadoresco." *RFE*, xxxii (1948), 493-519.

3284. Van Norden, Linda. "Celtic Antiquarianism in the 'Curious

Discourses." Pp. 65-70 in *Essays Critical and Historical Dedicated to Lily B. Campbell*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1950.

3285. Vendryes, J. "Les Elements celtiques de la legende du Graal." *Et. Celt.*, v (1950), 1-50.

3286. ———. "Le Graal dans le cycle breton." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 71-88.

3287. Viscardi, A. *Le Graal et les origines chretiennes de la Grande Bretagne*.

Rev. by P. G[rout] in *Let. Rom.*, iv (1950), 154-155.

3288. ———. "La Quête du Graal dans les romans du moyen âge italien." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 263-281.

3288a. Visser, Marie S. *De Figuur van de Vrouw in de troubadourslyriek, een Studie van de hoofdsde liefde*. (Leyden diss.) 's Gravenhage: Uitgeverij Excelsior, 1950.

Rev. by E. C. Van Bellen in *Museum*, lvi (1951), 62-65.

2243. Vossler, Karl. "Der Dichtung der Trobadors und ihre europäische Wirkung." 1937. Reprinted in *Aus der romanischen Welt*. Karlsruhe: Stahlberg Verlag [1948].

3289. Wade-Evans, A. W. "Vortigern." *N&Q*, cxcv (May 13, 1950), 200-203.

3290. ———. "Prolegomena to a Study of Early Welsh History." Pp. 1-41 in *The Historical Basis of Welsh Nationalism*. Cardiff: Plaid Cymru, 1950. There is also a Welsh translation by the same publishers.

3291. ———. *Coll Prydain*. [The loss of Britain.] Liverpool: Hugh Evans and Sons [?].

3291a. Wagner, R. Leon. *Textes d'étude (Ancien et moyen français)*. Lille: Giard, & Geneve: Droz, 1949.

Brief note by F.S. in *RF*, lxii (1950), 271.

3292. Walker, Curtis Howe. *Eleanor of Aquitaine*. (Fictionalized biography.) Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1950.

Rev. by Thomas Caldecot Chubb in *New York Times Bk. Rev.*, April 3, 1950, p. 3; by Richard M. Brace in *Chicago Tribune*, April 30, 1950, pt. 4, p. 6; by A. C. Krey in *AHR*, lvi (1950), 84-87; by Loren C. MacKinney in *Speculum*, xxvi (1951), 166-170.

3292a. Watkin, Morgan. "Testun Kulhwch a'i Gefndir Ffrengig eto (The Text of *Kulhwch* and its French Background Again)." *BBCS*, xiv (1950), 14-24.

3292b. Weber, Gottfried. "Gottfrieds Tristan in der Krise des hochmittelalterlichen Weltbildes um 1200." *ZDA*, lxxxii (1950), 335-388.

3293. Wesle, Carl. "Zu Wolframs Parzival." *Beiträge*, LXXII (1950), 1-38.

2927. Wettstein, Jacques. *Mezura l'idéal des troubadours*. 1945.

Rev. by Jeanne Lods in *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 142.

3293a. Whichard, Rogers Dey. "A Note on the Identity of Marie de France." *W. M. Day Studies*, pp. 177-181.

Whitsell, Frederick. See Martin Joos.

3294. Wiersma-Verschaffelt, Fr. "Quelques réflexions au sujet de l'iconographie du Graal." *Lumière du Graal*, pp. 324-327.

3051. Williams, Charles. *Arthurian Torso*. 1948.

Rev. by M. M. Mahood in *MLR*, XLV (1950), 238-239.

2929. Williams, Harry F. *Floriant et Florete*. 1947.

Rev. by Maurice Delbouille in *Rev. Belge*, xxviii (1950), 192-194.

3294a. Williams, Ifor. "Tydwl." (Nennius.) *BBCS*, xiii (1950), 195-196.

3295. Williams, Mary. "Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Arthurian Legend." *Durham Univ. Journal*, XLII (1949), 1-7. (BB 220)

3295a. Williamson, George. "The Structure of *The Waste Land*." *MP*, XLVII (1949-50), 191-206.

1731. Wilmotte, Maurice. *Le Roman du Graal d'après les versions les plus anciennes*. 1930. Reprinted with introduction by Armand Hoog. Paris: Le Club Français du Livre, 1949.

3296. Wilson, Robert H. "Malory's Early Knowledge of Arthurian Romance." *Univ. of Texas Studies in English*, xxix (1950), 33-50.

3297. ———. "Malory's 'French Book' Again." *Comp. Lit.*, II (1950), 172-181.

3298. Wind, Bartina H. (editor). *Les Fragments du Roman de Tristan. Poème du XII^e Siècle. Edités avec Commentaire*. (Thomas of Britain.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1950.

Rev. by K. Sneyders de Vogel in *Neophil.*, xxxv (1951), 57-58.

3299. Wolf, Werner. "Der Vogel Phönix und der Gral." *Panzer Studien*, pp. 73-95.

3299a. ———. "Zu den Hinweisstrophen auf die Wolframfragmente in der kleinen Heidelberger HS. des Jüngeren Titulrel." *ZDA*, LXXXII (1950), 256-264.

3300. Wolff, Ludwig. "Wolframs Schionatulander und Sigune." *Panzer Studien*, pp. 116-130.

3301. Woods, William. "Femininity in the *Lais* of Marie de France." *SP*, XLVII (1950), 1-19.

3301a. Wroten, Helen I. *Malory's Tale of King Arthur and the*

Emperor Lucius compared with its source the Alliterative Morte Arthur. (University of Illinois diss., 1950.) *Microfilm Abstracts*, xi (1951), 127-128.

3055. Zeydel, Edwin H. *The "Tristan und Isolde" of Gottfried von Strassburg.* 1948.

Additional rev. by A. Closs in *Erasmus*, III (1950), 717-718.

3302. ———. "Noch einmal zu Wolframs Kyot." *Neophil.*, xxxiv (1950), 11-15.

INDEX

- Aeneid*, 3232.
 Aesthetic criticism, 3175.
Amadis, 3261, 3267.
 American bibliography, 3173.
 Anthology, 3098, 3134, 3227.
 Antiquarianism, 3284.
 Arabic influences, 3226; poetry, 2806, 3240, 3250.
 Ariosto, Ludovico, 2940.
 Arnold, Matthew, 3183.
 Arthur, King, 3216, 3272a.
 Arthur and Lucius, 3199, 3301a.
 Arthurian Society, 3093, 3276.
 Arthurian Torso, 3051.
 Arthurians, List of, 3093.
 Arveragus, 3179.

 Bédier's *Tristan*, 2921.
 Biblical element, 3239.
 Bibliography, 3005, 3173, 3182, 3190, 3201, 3205, 3215, 3222, 3253, 3259a, 3264.
 Breton cycle, 3286; folklore, 3242.
Breudwyf Ronabwy, 3031.
 Britain, Legendary History, 3280.
 British bibliography, 3222.
Brut (English), 3235; see also Lawman.

 Catalan treatises, 3070.
 Cavalcanti, Guido, 3168.
 Celtic tradition, 2900, 3123, 3285; religion, 3247; antiquarianism, 3284.
 Characterization, 3199.
Charrette, 3174, 3252.
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, 3179.
 Chepman and Myllar prints, 3185.
Chievrefueil, 3218.
 Chivalry, 3070, 3073b.
 Chrétien de Troyes, 2838, 2872, 2967, 3073b, 3123, 3174, 3204, 3207, 3208, 3221, 3225, 3241, 3246, 3252, 3253, 3266, 3278, 3281.

 Chronology, 3191, 3207, 3209.
Cligès, 3246.
 Color, 3218a.
Conte del (du) Graal, 2872, 2967, 3073b, 3211, 3212, 3216b; see also *Perceval*.
 Courtly love, 3237, 3288a.
 Courts of love, 3234.
 Criticism, 3175, 3247a.
Culhwch, see *Kulhwch*.
Curious Discourses, 3284.

 Danish kings, 3186.
 Dante, 3169a, 3181.
Degrevant, Sir, 3071.
 Dominican rite, 3221a.
Durmart le Galois, 3216a.
 Dutch bibliography, 3201.

 Eilhart von Oberg, 3202.
 Eleanor of Aquitaine, 3228, 3292, 3295.
 English literature, 3178.
Erec, 3129, 3236.
 Erotic language, 3253a.
 Esotericism, 3217.
Estoire du Saint Graal, 3220, 3243.

 False death, 3246.
Faust, 3181.
 Femininity, 3301.
Fergus, 3238.
 Feudal background, 3175a.
 Fisher King, 3193.
Floriant et Florete, 2929.
Folie Tristan de Berne, 1093.
 Folklore, Breton, 3242.
Franklin's Tale, 3179.
 "French book," 3297.
 French literature, history of, 3198; bibliography, 3205; anthology, 3098, 3291a.

 Gaimar, 3186, 3280.

- Garter, Order of the, 3269.
Gawain and the Green Knight, 2910, 3184, 3194, 3195, 3223, 3262, 3275, 3277.
 Gawain Poet, 3194, 3195.
 Geoffrey of Monmouth, 3087, 3179, 3186, 3190a, 3229, 3280.
 German bibliography, 3215.
 Gildas, 3290, 3291.
 Gilgamesh-epic, 3232.
 Goethe, 3181.
 Gog, 3190a.
Golagrus and Gawain, 3185.
 Gottfried von Strassburg, 3055, 3116b, 3202a, 3203.
 Grail, 1731, 3073b, 3192, 3196, 3197, 3211, 3212, 3213, 3217, 3220, 3221a, 3243, 3244, 3248, 3253, 3256, 3257, 3266, 3270, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3294, 3299; Grail legend, 2900, 3285; Grail quest, 3232.
 Gralsburg, 3176.
 Green Knight, see *Gawain and the Green Knight*.
Guillaume d'Angleterre, 3208.
 Guilt, Parzival's, 3249.
 Hartmann von Aue, 3116b, 3231, 3236, 3258, 3279; Hartmann's *Iwein*, 3255, 3263.
 Heidelberg manuscript, 3299a.
 Heine, 3183.
 Historical criticism, 3175, 3176.
 Holinshed, 3235.
 Iconography, 3294.
 Irish legend, 3188.
 Iseult, see Tristan and Iseult.
 Italian romances, 3180, 3288.
Iwein, 3255, 3263.
Jaufre, 2444a.
 Joseph of Arimathea, 3202a.
 Kaherdin, 3259.
Knight of the Cart, see *Lancelot*.
 Knight Prisoner, 3177.
Krone, 3279.
Kulhwch ac Olwen, 3292a.
 Kyot, 3302.
 Lambert d'Ardres, 3221.
Lancelot, 3124, 3174, 3278, 3281; *Lancelot-Graal*, 3191, 3266.
Laurin, 3282.
 Lawman, Layamon, 3187, 3280.
 Lays, 3189, 3218, 3301.
 Lear, King, 3235.
 Lecto, Letto, 3230.
 Lyrical origins, 3084a, 3226.
Mabinogion, 3124, 3292a.
 Malory, 3177, 3199, 3200, 3296, 3297.
 Manessier, 3222a.
 Manuscript, 3214, 3299a.
 Map, Pseudo-, 3244.
 Marcabru, 3084a.
 Marie de France, 3301.
 Mark, King, 3188.
 Merlin, 3124; Merlin's island, 3001.
 Mimesis, 2754, 3273.
 Minnesinger, 3093c; minnesong, 3116b, 3134.
 Modern art, 3192; literature, 3190, 3192.
 Modred, Mordred, 3124.
 Morgan le Fay, 3124, 3184, 3210.
 Morold, 3203.
Mort Artu, 3214; *Morte Arthur* (alliterative), 3301a; *Morte Arthur* (stanzaic), 3200; *Morte le Roi Artu*, 3175; *Morte Darthur*, see *Malory*.
 Names, Arthurian, 3260.
 Narrative tenses, 3204.
 Nennius, 3294a.
 News Letter, 3259a.
 Other world, 3265.
 Paraphrases, 3194.
 Parsifal, 3202a.
 Parzival, 3129, 3175a, 3181, 3197, 3202, 3245, 3249, 3255, 3263, 3293.
 Pelles, 3193.
Perceforêt, 3087, 3241a.
 Perceval, Percival, 3124, 3266; *Perceval* continuations, 3158, 3222b; *Perceval le Gallois*, 2967, 3241, 3253; see also *Conte del Graal*.
 Phoenix, 3299.
 Pillow, enchanted, 3259.
 Place names, 3187.
 Provençal poetry, 3226, 3254.
 Pseudo-Map, 3244.
 Pseudo-Wauchier, 3158.
Queste del Saint Graal, 462, 463, 3192, 3239, 3244, 3288.
Quijote, Quixote, 3261, 3283.

- Religion, Celtic, 3247; Scandinavian, 3247.
 Rhonabwy, 3031.
 Robert de Boron, 3191, 3220.
 Ronsard, 3210.
 Round Table, Order of the, 3269.
- Scandinavian religion, 3247.
 Schionatulander und Sigune, 3300.
 Shakespeare, 3235.
 Sir Gawain, see Gawain.
 Substantival adjective, 3195.
 Survival of King Arthur, 3272a.
 Symbolism, 3218a, 3243.
- Theological background, 3175a.
 Thomas of Britain, 3298.
Tirant lo Blanc, 3271.
 Tituli lapis, 3294a.
Titurel, 3206, 3299a.
 Toothache, 3237.
 Tristan, Tristram, Tristrem, 3124, 3224, 3259, 3266, 3298; *Tristan et Iseult*, 2921; *Tristan und Isolde*, 3055, 3251, 3292b; *Tristram and Iseult*, 3183; *Tristrant*, 3202.
 Troubadours, 2927, 3022a, 3093c, 3234; troubadour love, 3267, 3283; lyrics, 2243, 3157, 3288a.
 Tudor opinion, 3247a.
 Tydwl, 3294a.
- Ulrich von Liechtenstein, 3219.
- Victorian literature, 3190, 3270.
 Virgil, 3232.
Vita Nuova, 3169a.
 Vivian, Vivien, 3124.
 Vortigern, 3289.
- Wace, 3209, 3280.
Waste Land, 3197, 3295a.
 Wessex, 3028.
 Wildenberg, 3176.
 Wolfram von Eschenbach, 3116b, 3175a, 3181, 3245, 3255, 3268, 3272, 3279, 3293, 3299a, 3300, 3302.
 Yvain, 3073b.

PICARESQUE ELEMENTS IN THOMAS MANN'S WORK

By OSKAR SEIDLIN

Whether little Lazarus of Tormes or any of his rascally breed should or should not be considered the direct ancestor of the protagonist of the German *Schelmenroman*, it is to the picaresque spirit that German literature owes one of its most lively and impressive fictional characters, Simplicius Simplicissimus.¹ Never before and hardly ever since has Germany moved so close to the country beyond the Pyrenees as in the seventeenth century. Lessing's critical hammerblows had severed the ties between German letters and those of the Romance countries, and the efforts of the Romantics to mend the broken alliance with Spain bore fruit only on a secondary plane, in the field of translation to which Tieck contributed his unsurpassable German *Don Quijote* and his charming rendition of Vincente Espinel's *Vida y aventuras del escudero Marcos de Obregon*.² Only in our century, in the work of Hugo von Hofmannsthal, have Spain and her literary heritage acted again as a leaven on the creative imagination, although the scene, now conjured up, is not the misery-ridden dwelling of the picaresque guttersnipe, but the resplendent *teatro del mundo* of the Catholic universe. That this revival took place in the Hapsburg Empire was not surprising, because it was here that, for political and religious reasons, the memory of the *siglo de oro* had lingered on, waiting for the opportune moment to rise again to the surface.

Yet it seems that even after more than three centuries Picaro is not dead. Again he has appeared on the scene of great literature, and although his features have changed, although the primitive little hoodlum of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has turned into a highly sophisticated and psychologically complex character, it may still be possible to discern the long familiar, amusingly shocking type underneath the new clothes, in the midst of an entirely transformed spiritual and cultural setting. To find Thomas Mann among those who in their works have again brought the disrespectful rascal to life,

¹ For the impact of the picaresque novel on German literature and on Grimmelshausen in particular, cf. Albert Schultheiss, *Der Schelmenroman der Spanier und seine Nachbildungen* (Hamburg, 1893); Adam Schneider, *Spaniens Anteil an der deutschen Literatur des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts* (Strassburg, 1898), pp. 205-22; Julius Schwering, *Litterarische Beziehungen zwischen Spanien und Deutschland* (Münster, 1902), pp. 65-71; Hubert Rausse, *Zur Geschichte des spanischen Schelmenromans in Deutschland* (Münster, 1908); J. J. A. Bertrand, "Ludwig Tieck et le roman picaresque," *Revue Germanique*, X (1914), 443 ff.

² At about the same time, 1801 and 1802 respectively, two additional Spanish picaresque novels appeared in Germany. C. A. Fischer translated *Gran Tacaño* and published a new and literal version of Mateo Aleman's *Vida y hechos del picaro Guzman de Alfarache*, the first picaresque novel to be imported to Germany in Aegidius Albertus' "translation" of 1615.

may, at first glance, be startling and incredible. His acquaintance with Spanish literature is comparatively slight, and that he ever found suitable companions in such questionable characters as Lazarillo, Guzman, and their ilk is more than doubtful. Yet it is quite imaginable that a historical and cultural situation which prepared the soil on which Picaro could grow, was, in its basic elements, duplicated in another country and another era, so that a new Picaro was bound to emerge.

Undoubtedly, Thomas Mann, when recreating the old type, was originally quite unconscious of its literary ancestors. But, in due course, he became more and more aware of the fundamental affinity between a specific age-old tradition and some of his own work. In recent years, the term *Schelmenroman* has become quite familiar to him, and it is not in the least surprising that he applies this term to two of his own works in which, indeed, a new Picaro has come to life, *Die Bekenntnisse des Hochstaplers Felix Krull*³ and *Joseph und seine Brüder*.⁴ To be sure, the word is used with a broad meaning—as it must be pointed out that the German term *Schelm* has a much wider range than the Spanish *picaro*—yet there is no doubt that Thomas Mann's extremely subtle feeling for Western heritage and tradition has gradually made him aware of subterranean communications between his own work and long-established types of the European novel.

The fragmentary novel, *Die Bekenntnisse des Hochstaplers Felix Krull*, was begun, and left unfinished, in 1911, and clearly belongs to the phase in which the *Künstler-Bürger* conflict, the problematic situation of the man of imagination in a soberly realistic and commonplace world, formed the center of Thomas Mann's thinking and writing. It may seem no more than a satyr-interlude between *Tonio Kröger* and *Tod in Venedig* with the outsider, the "artist," frankly transgressing the line of lawful existence and becoming overtly what Thomas Mann's artists, when viewed from the vantage point of bourgeois society, always have been latently: *Hochstapler*, mountebanks. Unquestionably the most humorous and light-hearted of all of Thomas Mann's productions, it carries so many undertones that a slight shift in emphasis will reveal Thomas Mann's "hero" as a member of a family much older than the clan of outcast artists who have populated the Continental novel since the beginning of the nineteenth century. If he is not Picaro himself, he is at least one of his first cousins.

³ *Die Entstehung des Dr. Faustus* (Amsterdam, 1949), p. 24. It may be more than a coincidence that in these late years Thomas Mann was seriously preoccupied with *Simplicissimus*. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 71, 84.

⁴ Karl Kerenyi, *Romandichtung und Mythologie* (Zürich, 1945), p. 83. In a letter to Kerenyi Thomas Mann writes: "Joseph's actions and transactions are morally-aesthetically acceptable only from the vantage point of the divine *Schelmenroman*."

Picaro was born when an empire, which could boast that the sun did not set on its confines, was gradually being undermined by slow yet steady decay; when values and institutions whose strength was still officially proclaimed had step by step fallen victims to doubt and corruption; when behind the noble façade of a world dreaming of fabulous expansion and unheard-of exploits, the reality of exhaustion, poverty, and disillusion made its wretched appearance. The scenery upon which Picaro moves is an empire on the eve of disintegration, its atmosphere the bitter and comic dichotomy between a hollow claim to greatness and the inexorable misery of everyday life. Since, at every turn, reality contradicts all high-flown pretensions, every act becomes an act of unmasking, and the little rascal who laughs at the ethical code of established society emerges as the victor in the battle for life. To be sure, he is a rogue, a cheat, a conniver—but what else can he be in a world from which every trace of true stability has gone, where the pillars of society are rotten to the core, false theatrical props which, in the merciless light of day, prove to be shallow, ludicrous, or, at best, pitiful? Life has become a cat-and-mouse game, and the only way to deal with it is to outwit it.

That was Spain in the sixteenth century. And now a glance at Thomas Mann's German family shortly before the outbreak of the First World War in which the great European structure received the death blow. There is the father, Mr. Engelbert Krull, the "backbone" of the family. Yet his entire existence is a most dubious, though amiable, fraud. He manufactures champagne,⁵ wine with bubbles, a most spurious product by the way, whose only merit is the "coiffure" (11),⁶ the attractive make-up, culminating in a highly decorative and misleading label. On a much more elegant level, he shortchanges his customers no less than Lazarillo's father who makes his little profit by tampering with the sacks of flour he has to deliver. In both cases the "coiffure," be it wine bottles or flour bags, is flawless, but the contents, the substance, show a deplorable deficiency. A higher and brutal justice, which seems unable to take a joke, catches up with both of them: Lazarillo's father ends in jail, Felix's "poor" father makes an end of it with the help of a revolver after the glamorous edifice of his bourgeois existence, erected on sham, fraudulent credits, and well-concealed insolvency, has come crashing down on him. He goes bankrupt, as thoroughly bankrupt as the father of Guzman de Alfarache whose economic position was about as sound as Engelbert Krull's.

Of course, it would be unfair to compare Mrs. Krull, a lady of worldly refinement, to Lazarillo's mother, who is evidently nothing

⁵ The German word *Schaumwein* renders the symbolic meaning of Mr. Krull's business much more aptly, because the word ("foaming wine") implies the degree of flimsiness which has been injected into a product of nature which once, in mythical days, was held sacred as a symbol of the nourishing solidity of the good earth (Bread and Wine).

⁶ References to *Bekenntnisse des Hochstaplers Felix Krull* are taken from the enlarged edition (Amsterdam, 1937).

but a cheap trollop. Yet we cannot forget that one of the main attractions which draws a crowd of devoted cronies into Mrs. Krull's lavish *salon* is of a somewhat questionable nature, too; for what she and her daughter Olympia gladly offer their male guests are "deep insights" (29)—into their shockingly low-cut décolletés when bending gracefully over the back of an elegant davenport. And after the disaster has descended upon the "backbone" of the families, the two ladies, Mrs. Krull and Lazarillo's mother, move to the big city to open boarding houses: homeless and deracinated people providing a pseudo-home for other homeless and deracinated people, a pied-à-terre for a night or a week or a month; and although we do not wish to cast any disparaging light upon Mrs. Krull's new profession, it must be mentioned that her lodgers enjoyed her liberality and tolerance, her gaiety and comfort, no less than her cuisine (117).

This is the stock, a worm-eaten and shaky stock, from which the old and the new Picaro descend. Even their respective places of birth seem to have a symbolical meaning. Is it just an accident that Lazarillo first saw the light of day on the river Tormes, in the midst of the river actually, so that his very entrance into life is marked by an ominous lack of stability, of firm ground on which to stand? And it is the nearness to the unstable element, the water, with which Felix Krull begins his autobiography, the charming description of the banks of the Rhine, the laughing and wine-studded countenance of the stream flowing past such famous spas as Wiesbaden, Homburg, Langenschwalbach, and Schlangenbad (10) whose very names evoke the association of casinos, vacation from life, and playful insincerity. It is not until *Tod in Venedig*, for the sake of which Thomas Mann interrupted the story of the mountebank and which represents the tragic continuation of what he had started, in his *Felix Krull*, as the comic autobiography of an "anti-hero,"⁷ that the city on the water, the city in the water, becomes a symbol of the dissolution and disintegration of a structurally solid existence; but that both Lazarillo's and Felix's first glimpse of the world is the glimpse at the "bottomless" element may not be without meaning for the further course of their lives. Indeed, it should be pointed out that among Thomas Mann's fictional characters Felix Krull is the only one to grow up in Western Germany, in the Rhineland more specifically, that part of Germany which, through history and mentality, has preserved the most noticeable affinity to the Latin, the Mediterranean world. The spirited "cheat" is Thomas Mann's only Catholic hero,⁸ and it may

⁷ Frank W. Chandler in his *Literature of Roguery* (Boston, 1907), I, 5, calls the picaresque novel "the comic biography (or more often the autobiography) of an anti-hero."

⁸ I disregard here consciously the Catholic as a humanist as he appears in Thomas Mann's latest work, *Doktor Faustus*, because, characteristically enough, Serenus Zeitblom is only the prism in which the bitter Protestant fate of Adrian Leverkühn is reflected.

very well be that only the Catholic world could produce the figure of Picaro: a world enamoured of color and lightheartedness so that the imaginative performance of even a rascal can be relished; credulous enough to accept the miracle even if it is no more than the ingenious feat of a prestidigitator; so used to transubstantiation that the volte-face of the actor who is a number of persons in one becomes acceptable; a world skeptical enough to take lightly the grim call "to prove oneself," which makes it perfectly legitimate to play a trick on reality; a world so conscious of the meaning and importance of the symbolic act that it must seem pedestrian and humorless to submit to the gray literalness of life.

To fight against the gray literalness of life—that is Felix Krull's mission, and with all its dubious and perverted slant, a mission indeed, not less edifying and entertaining than Picaro's mission to keep alive despite the stubborn resistance offered by circumstances, to come out on top although everything and everybody conspire to keep him down. It is true, Picaro is no more than a little animal equipped with a shrewd and spontaneous instinct, while Thomas Mann's hero has worked out his program with such refinement and subtlety that he stands before us as the supreme artist of life. But both of them have one objective: *corriger la fortune*; and it makes little difference that, for Lazarillo, the highest satisfaction consists in getting his belly full, while Felix Krull aims at a complete victory of the creative ingenuity of mind over dead and sluggish matter. If, by a sheer act of will, he produces all the symptoms of a gastric disturbance (60 ff.), fever, fits of convulsion, and vomiting, he does so not only in order to stay away from the loathed classroom—which, to be sure, is the primary objective—but for the exalted purpose of proving that the unimaginative lethargy of the body can be forced under the control of a supreme mind:

Now I had produced them, these symptoms, I had endowed them with as much effectiveness as they might ever have had, if they had come about without my help. I had corrected nature, I had realized a dream, and only he who out of nothing, out of the mere knowledge of things and the insight into them, in brief: out of imagination, is able to produce an effective reality, can appreciate the strange and dream-like satisfaction with which I rested after my act of creation. (66)

Every action of Krull manifests the victory of imagination over the silly seriousness of reality. You need not be a violinist to revel in the ovation reserved for a great artistic performance. Two little sticks of wood are enough, and if you manipulate them with the dexterous charm of a child prodigy in front of a music pavilion, the crowd will burst into applause as if there had been heavenly music where actually there was none (31 ff.). We could run through every instance of young Felix's life, through every incident from which he learns the great mastery of things; it will always be the triumph of wit, in-

geniuity, graceful shrewdness over the dullwittedness and clumsiness of matter and fact. The proud satisfaction that Felix consciously enjoys is the same satisfaction which the reader of the pranks of Lazarillo, Guzman, and their brethren unconsciously derives from the delightful fact that the weakling is not so weak after all; that, when he puts his scheming brain to work, he can snap his fingers at the powers that be; that he can lead by the nose the pompous, the mighty, the respectable.

What Krull enacts is a permanent and triumphant rejection of reality, and this is basically the masterful game of the Picaro as well. But not to be subject to the dictates of a given situation, creating steadily one's own reality, means to be free. This is the boundless freedom of the Picaro who roams as he pleases, taking up an engagement today and leaving it tomorrow, not tied down by any responsibilities, open to every suggestion that may come along. There is no home, no family, no profession, no possession that can hold the roving rascal, and it seems only natural that the picaresque novel should so soon have been transformed into a novel of travel and adventure, with the wide world as a background. Lazarillo setting sail and being brought back as a sea-monster, Guzman in Rome, Guzman among the pirates, Alfonso thrown in with a gypsy band—these are the stock situations of the picaresque novel, and at the very beginning of his autobiography Felix Krull drops modest hints at the world-wide trips he made in pursuit of his "profession." So powerful is the atmosphere of freedom that the world in which Picaro moves loses all cohesion, dissolves into a sequence of disconnected "tableaux," held together only by the accidental and haphazard journeys of the hero. This lack of integration explains the typical "flash-light" technique of the picaresque novel. Places and faces emerge as if conjured up out of the void, fulfill their functions as background, as partners in the Picaro's life-game, and disappear as quickly as they have come into existence. The hero is too weak, or too free, to hold fast to anything for any length of time. His world, so lacking in stability, offers the kind of spectacle we enjoy in a kaleidoscope, and casts upon the reader the same sort of magic, fairytale-like spell. It is quite characteristic that Thomas Mann notes: "In Krull the world could have been phantasmagoric."⁹ In fact, it had to be phantasmagoric, a loose and uncoordinated jumble of time and space, in order to express the disintegration of a structural pattern in the midst of boundless freedom. It is not by chance that Felix Krull, when setting down the facts of his life, does not feel bound to any sequence of time, but freely jumps from experiences of his early youth to events of his adolescence.

The unwillingness or the incapacity of the Picaro to hold on, to steady himself, to renounce his utter freedom, transforms his life into an uncoordinated succession of "strokes of luck," good luck and bad

⁹ *Die Entstehung des Dr. Faustus*, p. 27.

luck, a whimsical wave of ups and downs, unexpected riches today, pitiful misery tomorrow. Life itself has become a roulette game, and we do not need the anticipatory hints in Krull's autobiography to predict that the casino will become the scene of some of his most remarkable exploits. Life, given over to extreme freedom, cannot help losing all clear destination, moving along without "destiny" and exhibiting at every point the arbitrariness of pure chance.

It is only logical that the uprooted hero finds himself drawn to groups which have "freed" themselves from the organic whole of society, irregulars and outcasts whose existence is through and through anarchic. Alcala Yavez y Rivera's Alonso falls in with the gypsies, Guzman concludes a mischievous pact with the pirates, Queveda Villegas' Buscon joins a group of strolling actors, Cervantes' Rinconete y Cortadillo become members of a highly ingenious gang of pickpockets, burglars, and pimps.¹⁰ It is very much in the spirit of the picaresque novel, although anything but a literal rendering of the text when, around 1620, the first German "translator" of the second part of *Guzman* (he used the unauthentic second part by Sayavedra¹¹) leads his hero through Germany as a member of a theatrical group. Needless to point out what magic threat the word "gypsy" yields in Thomas Mann's early work (*Tonio Kröger*); that Felix Krull is being initiated into the highest wisdom by an artist whose respectability is not exactly heightened by the fact that he has added, without any authorization, the title "Professor" to his name; that Felix's first overwhelming experience which shows him the irresistible power of dissimulation, takes place in a theater, with an operetta tenor officiating as the high priest of bewitchment (41 ff.). (Of course, it is an operetta, music with bubbles, about as cheap and unsubstantial as old Mr. Krull's merchandise.)

Picaro, the free hero, free from everything and everybody, is by this very token the lonely hero as well. He is always and basically an orphan, which is in his case not simply a matter of the premature disappearance of his parents, but the true and tragic signature of his existence. The authors of the picaresque novels take great pains to avoid in their stories any note of pathos and obvious compassion, yet the terrible loneliness of the roguish hero cannot fail to move us, even if such an emotion is not "in the book."¹² There is in all picaresque

¹⁰ Cervantes' *novela* is so clearly a story of outright criminals that, strictly speaking, it does not belong to the genre of the picaresque novel. Yet the author himself states that it was conceived "in gusto picaresco." Its first German version, under the title *Isaak Winckelfelder und Jobst von der Schneid*, appeared in 1617, bound together with the first German translation of *Lazarillo de Tormes*. The translator, Nikolaus Ulenhart, presented Cervantes' story as his own work. He could do that the much more easily since he had cleverly transplanted the locale to Germany, specifically Bohemia.

¹¹ The actual author of this pseudo-*Guzman* was Juan Marti, a lawyer from Valencia.

¹² It is certainly more than accidental that the name of the first and liveliest of all Picaros is a play on the name of poor Lazarus, prototype of all human

novels the painful inability of the hero to establish human relationships, be it friendship or love, because the one who is so free that he belongs to nothing and nobody, has nothing and nobody that will ever belong to him. There is a remarkable similarity between Lazarillo's and Felix Krull's first—and only—experience with the other sex. Toward the end of Lazarillo's report the lonely Picaro seems to find marital happiness. Yet it turns out that the girl who becomes his wife actually "belongs" to a very affluent gentleman who marries this servant girl off to Lazarillo so that he can carry on with her all the more safely and inconspicuously. Felix is initiated into the secrets of sex by a buxom chambermaid, yet, delightful as this initiation turns out to be, he too is only a "substitute" for the dully respectable station-master to whom the girl has been engaged for many years and whom she cannot marry for financial reasons. In this episode (80 ff.) Felix Krull lives up to his role of a perfect cheat, and actually fulfills the picaresque pattern much better than his sixteenth-century counterpart who is, after all, only a pitiful cuckold; yet, although he gets the utmost pleasure out of his "love" affair, is he not actually the cheated one, a mere fill-in, condemned to be alone even in the rapture of the most intimate union? Is there in this case really any difference between being a poor little Lazarus and a "Felix"? Thomas Mann has clearly recognized that one of the mainsprings of his picaresque novel, if not *the* mainspring altogether, is the "motif of loneliness," no less noticeable for the fact that it is treated here "in a humorous and criminal fashion."¹³ It is not surprising that in both the periods of his life when his mind was preoccupied with the charming cheat—in 1911 when he wrote the first chapters of *Felix Krull*, and in 1943 when he toyed with the idea of finishing the fragment—the problem of loneliness generated such a vehement driving power that it could no longer be handled in a "humorous and criminal fashion," but had to reveal itself in its stark and merciless cruelty, in the inexorable fates of Gustav Aschenbach and Adrian Leverkühn.

Is it too much to assume that the typical form of the picaresque novel, the autobiographic report, has something to do with this "motif of loneliness"? It is startling that almost every picaresque novel presents itself as a first-person narrative, and this may indeed be the proper form to communicate the lonely life in a world from which all cohesion has gone. If the validity of all norms, all authority,

wretchedness. Indeed, one should not miss the ironic undertone in this name-giving, as little as one should miss the ironic undertone in Krull's name, Felix. That the names of our heroes show this strong similarity—through contrast—must not go unnoticed. L. Gauchat in his article "Lazarillo de Tormes und die Anfänge des Schelmenromans," *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, LXVI (1912), 430 ff., fails to note the ironic connotation of the name Lazarillo and sees in Picaro mainly "the image of a poor devil." This is definitely much too narrow and oversimplified an interpretation of the character of the immortal rascal.

¹³ *Die Entstehung des Dr. Faustus*, p. 26.

all reality, is rejected; if there is no center powerful enough to organize the dissolute fragments of life into an organic whole, what is there left but the lonely "I" which rules supreme and remains the only focus which can hold and release the fleeting phenomena of the world. For the human being who is not "involved" but a free outsider, life is no longer a fabric into which the thread of his own existence is woven, an objective reality valid and binding beyond his own personal experience, but loose and unshaped raw material for his subjective apperception. Such an existential situation becomes expressible only under the narrative form of "I." Of all of Thomas Mann's major works it is only his picaresque novel that presents itself as an autobiography.¹⁴

In an autobiography the world has no autonomous weight, life does not present itself as something that "happens" before our eyes, but as something that has happened, something gone by, "finished," dead. It has no actuality, no presentness ("keine Zuhandenheit," as Heidegger would put it), it does not occur, but is "only" remembered—and the word "remembered" is to be taken here in its most literal meaning, as the re-mem-bering of something which is basically dis-membered and disjointed. The vantage point of the narrator, of the "I," is always "after the event," never "in the midst of the event." Life becomes relatable only after it has passed, in the calm of deadness. It is for this reason that so many of the picaresque novels are told by a recluse, a hero who, after an exciting life, has completely withdrawn from the world, thoroughly and utterly alone with himself, living in a void which he now fills retrospectively with "things past," with images existing only in and through his own isolated consciousness. The world is nothing but a memory, indeed "phantasmagoric," and every picaresque novel, every autobiography could start with the opening words of *Felix Krull*: "While seizing the pen, in full leisure and withdrawal, healthy by the way, though tired, very tired. . ." (7). It is no accident that the greatest autobiography in world literature, St. Augustine's *Confessions*, was written after a conversion, after life, one way of life, had come to an end, after its hero, completely detached from his previous existence, had become dead to the world, or rather after this particular world had become nonexistent to him.¹⁵

¹⁴ The only other narrative in the first person worth mentioning is his short story *Der Bajazzo* in which the problem of human loneliness and pernicious freedom is no less acute. The very title, clownishness as a principle of life, brings this *Novelle* into the neighborhood of the picaresque genre. *Doktor Faustus* is a pseudo-autobiographical novel with the narrator telling the life-story of the hero, his friend Adrian Leverkühn. Yet Thomas Mann points out (*Die Entstehung des Dr. Faustus*, p. 26) that his renewed preoccupation with the *Krull*-fragment may be responsible for the narrative form which his last great novel was to exhibit.

¹⁵ Goethe's *Dichtung und Wahrheit* seems to me the only exception to this basic principle of great autobiographical writing. It is the only example where, in an autobiography, the full autonomy of reality is preserved, where the world is more than just a catalyst, an obstacle, digested or to-be-digested raw material

It is the basic implication of a first-person narrative that the world has been swallowed up, that the "I" has become the center of all things. In this very form, the form of the autobiography, lies the intrinsic ironical connotation of the picaresque novel. The discrepancy between the wretched, lowly Picaro who does not amount to anything in this world, and the effrontery with which he dares to say "I," is in itself a piece of *blague*, of persiflage and roguery, probably felt much more keenly than today in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when the weight and dignity of a person depended heavily on his status in life, although the conviction that it is presumptuous to write one's autobiography is by no means dead today and unwittingly leads to the question: "Who is he, after all, to claim our attention for his 'I'?" In the case of Thomas Mann this persiflage, only tacitly implied in the picaresque novels by their very form, is quite conscious and one of the sources of most refined delight. That the unreformed scoundrel dares call the report on his mischievous tricks *Bekenntnisse*, thus evoking associations with two of the most profound and soul-searching literary documents of mankind, St. Augustine's and Jean Jacques Rousseau's *Confessions*, is in itself the height of impertinence, a slap in the face of anything honest, sincere, and serious. The frivolous masquerader, whose whole life is nothing but a sequence of frauds, deceits, and petty crimes, usurps words and forms that belong to an entirely different human level and thus ridicules and "unmasks" values and emotional patterns that once, when the world was still "whole," were respected, binding, and holy.¹⁰ From this act of usurpation results the devastating humor of Thomas Mann's novelistic fragment. The profound hilarity of the book does not rest on the recital of the ingenious exploits of the hero, no matter how genuinely funny they are, but in the dichotomy between a dignified and noble style—style meaning here both human bearing and verbal expression—and the flimsy person who decks himself out with this ill-fitting robe. Instead of giving grandeur to the hero, it makes fun of the "heroic" attitude and reveals this form of life as a ludicrous hoax.

There is another form of implied or insinuated *blague* and parody which links the picaresque novel and *Felix Krull*: the didactic element. In the picaresque novel, with the noticeable exception of

for an ego. It is for this reason that Goethe's autobiography develops again and again into an objective narrative with situations, historical events, cultural movements actually "present" and not automatically and immediately related to the relating "I." At a certain point Goethe goes so far as to apologize for soliciting the reader's attention to his own person; a very strange remark indeed in an autobiography, but very indicative of the unique objective attitude of *Dichtung und Wahrheit*.

¹⁰ It should be pointed out here that the literary persiflage of Spain's greatest book, *Don Quijote*, rests on the same principle: the ridiculing of a once meaningful pattern of life by its reenactment, deadly serious and for this reason foolish, at the "wrong" historical moment and by a "wrong" person. Thomas Mann has paid tribute to one of mankind's greatest books in his beautiful essay "Meerfahrt mit Don Quijote," *Leiden und Größe der Meister* (Berlin, 1935), pp. 212 ff.

Lasarillo de Tormes, the moral preaching of the author takes up long and, for the modern reader, extremely tedious stretches. These insertions have always been explained as a *captatio benevolentiae*, a concession of the author to pacify the ire of the Inquisition and other institutions set up to prevent moral and religious infractions. Yet it must be pointed out that a *captatio benevolentiae* always contains an element of cynicism, of tongue-in-cheek irony. How is it possible for the author to take delight in the evidently immoral career of his hero, how can he possibly arouse in the reader delight at his hero's mischievousness, and then with a straight face go into long exhortations and edifying sermons? But what if the face is not quite straight, what if, unwittingly and unwillingly, there is a twinkle in the author's and the reader's eyes when switching from the roguish laughter to the grim pounding of the moralistic drums? There is an episode in *Don Quijote*, one of the most heart-rending episodes in the book, which rests on the same principle. It is the story of the expelled Moor who assures us in the most cruelly self-accusing words that he has been rightly expelled, because he and his racial fellows are enemies of the country and had to be driven out in the interest of the state. And then he goes on to tell how he dreams day and night of his beloved Spain, how wretched his life has become since he had to leave the country of his forefathers. Here, as in the picaresque novels with their long declamations on the "official" moral code, a strangely ironic cancellation of the accepted and loudly professed standards—in Cervantes' case Philip's policy of mass expulsion—is at work. Evidently, the good Moor who loves his fatherland with all his heart cannot possibly be an enemy of his country, no matter how eloquently he accuses himself of high treason and renders lip service to the official political "line." This process of undermining the valid and accepted moral code just by professing it loudly is most likely entirely unconscious in the picaresque author, as it is most unlikely that Cervantes consciously wanted to attack Philip's policy of depopulation. Yet the effect of a devaluation in the very values so pompously upheld within earshot of a Picaro is undeniable.

Of course, in the case of Thomas Mann the ironic effect is quite conscious and leads to a constant "twinkling of the eye." The irresponsible rascal is full of a most substantial philosophy of life, if we look closely enough, a strict and outspoken "idealism," permanently and most convincingly expounding the power of spirit over dull matter. He arrives at lofty philosophical conclusions, not by confessing things which are at variance with his own convictions, but by verbalizing the very philosophical foundations of his existence. Listen to him:

Life, to be sure, is not at all the highest of all goods to which we have to cling because it is so enjoyable. On the contrary, it is to be taken as a hard and austere task, confronting us or, as it seems to me, chosen by us voluntarily, which it is

our duty to sustain with steadfastness and faithfulness and from which to run away prematurely bespeaks unquestionably a most slovenly conduct. (104)

What a magnificent piece of double-talk, we are inclined to say. Yet the amusing fact is that it is no double-talk, but the perfectly "honest" confession of the cheat, and, by being just that, the most murderous parody of the solemnity of idealism. This, indeed, is highest irony, the devilish workings of a process by which the shallowness of all high-sounding principles is revealed—not by attacking them, but by professing them in all sincerity.

The old and familiar feature of didacticism is preserved in Thomas Mann's novel not only in the philosophical pronunciamientos of the hero, but in the introduction of a character who fulfills the function of the "mentor" of old picaresque literature, and is specifically described by the hero as such. He appears as the wise old man with penetrating eyes who guides Felix at the decisive turns of his life. Yet his very name gives away the direction and the aspects of life which he opens up for his disciple. "Professor" Schimmelpreester is only too willing to disclose the etymological origin of his name (and the name is certainly more than "sound and smoke" in this case): "'Nature,' so he said, 'is nothing but putrefaction and mould, and I am ordained as its priest; therefore my name is Schimmelpreester'" (35). The priest as mentor, this is the old pattern of the didactic novel, yet what a strange and perverted priesthood which, in our special case, communicates the essence of life to the novice! But even the disdainful condemnation: "Nature is nothing but putrefaction and mould" makes this dubious "priest" still more akin to the zealous and ascetic hermit in the wilderness who plays the part of the mentor and spiritual guide in the picaresque novel, at least in its German version *Simplicius Simplicissimus*.

It is not difficult to distinguish in *Lazarillo* an analogous character, the figure of an ironically warped mentor. He is the beggar who, at the very beginning, promises the innocent and trusting little hero to initiate him into life. That he is blind, dead to the sight of the world, qualifies him about as well for his educational mission as the "putrefaction priesthood" qualifies the "Professor" for his lofty office. What he teaches his charge is about as wholesome to Lazarillo as Mr. Schimmelpreester's philosophy of life is to Felix. It is a school of thievery and petty crime through which the beggar puts Lazarillo, and when, at the end of the apprenticeship, Lazarillo leads his master into a trap and robs him of his last coppers, we cannot feel too sorry that the mentor is given a dose of his own medicine. Yet the archetype of mentorship is discernible in the wretched tramp no less than in Mr. Schimmelpreester's priesthood. The lack and the renunciation of earthly riches have been associated again and again with the highest wisdom, with a concentration on the "essentials." Yet in the

"mouldy" priest and the thieving beggar the role of mentorship is ironically devaluated and travestied.

To play tricks on everything respectable, powerful institutions, noble traditions, established values, this is, as we have tried to show, the *Picaro's* chief "mission." The free hero, not being subject to the powers that be, can show them up in all their absurdity and rottenness. It is for this reason that the picaresque novel represents one of the highpoints of satirical literature, and this, indeed, quite consciously. Reality is laughed out of existence, the pompous and righteous representatives of the existing order stand revealed in their hypocrisy and corruption. As we follow the little rascal on his devious and twisted tours and detours, we cannot help reacting to his exploits in a most "immoral" way by saying "More power to him," more power over the miserly and heartless priests, the learned pedants, the inflated politicians, the corrupt sellers of indulgences. Indeed, these attacks upon the pillars of society are so strong that we understand the reluctance of many authors of picaresque novels to sign their names to their works. The bitter satire is by no means only a by-product of the picaresque novel, and it was not taken as such by contemporary readers. The little rogue was meant to be much more than merely a carrier and conveyor of jokes and pranks, and in his introductory epigram to Mateo Aleman's *Guzman de Alfarache* Vincente Espinel could flatly state: "You put your finger on festering sores."¹⁷ A great deal of Alcala Yavez y Rivera's *Alonso* is a bitter take-off on the corruption of the various professions and social estates; the same is true for Quevedo Villegas' *Vida del Buscon*.

With Thomas Mann, the satire is much subtler and much more veiled. Yet our perverse sympathy for the mountebank is based on the fact that his antagonists, the representatives of the respectable world, are revoltingly stupid—or worse. Why should one not cheat those gullible fools who almost ask to have the wool pulled over their eyes, falling into spasms of admiration at the performance of a child prodigy who uses two wooden sticks as a violin, or of an operetta tenor, a coarse and ugly individual, who bewitches the audience with the help of half a pound of make-up and an insipid make-believe of "high life"? As in the picaresque novel our reaction is: it serves them right. It surely serves Dr. Düsing right to be deceived by a perfect humbug (66 ff.), conceited fool that he is, basically indifferent to the health of his patients and only concerned with his own reputation and advancement.¹⁸ However, Felix's master stroke—and, in my

¹⁷ The ambitious and serious aims of *Guzman de Alfarache* are equally indicated by its subtitle "Atalaya de la Vida Humana," although we should not fail to hear in this edifying flourish the same ironical undertone which we distinguish in the slightly mocking name of *Lazarillo*.

¹⁸ Poking fun at ridiculously "learned" and corrupt health-practitioners and quacks seems to be particularly popular with the picaresque genre, e.g., *Guzman's* plotting with the two surgeons to gain access to the cardinal's castle in Rome. This feature is quite prominent in the overwhelmingly funny "medical" polemics

opinion, the funniest episode in all of modern German prose literature—is his gulling of the military commission to which he reports for induction, or rather for the prevention of his induction (152 ff.). Here is "authority" pilloried at its most merciless, in its pompously learned stupidity, its pedantic thoroughness, its stern righteousness, its tricky pseudo-benevolence, its lurking suspicion that everybody and everything is out to deceive it—and all this outwitted and out-tricked by a splendid performance, not by resistance, but by meek submission, by homely "honesty," by eager readiness to serve—in short, by all the qualities that befit a good and desirable subject of the crown. On this occasion Felix Krull excels himself, he plays all his trumps, and he knows that he has to. For it is the most deadly danger that threatens him, the very negation of his "free" existence: the threat to be put into "the service," to be subjected to regimentation and "uniformation," to be molded into a useful member of an equalized society. What he wards off here is the frontal attack on his aristocratic aloofness, on the proud feeling of superiority and uniqueness which is the birthright of the free.

The cheat, the rejector of reality, as the aristocrat—this is a perfectly logical equation, and with Thomas Mann it is so prominent that it cannot be overlooked. Yet, strange as it may sound, even the ragged and tossed-about Picaro is basically an aristocratic figure, and his characterization as a "bastard of pride and pauperization"¹⁹ thoroughly acceptable. He is too proud and too good for a humdrum existence, for earning his livelihood in the sweat of his brow. Even though we should not miss the latent satiric attack on the arrogant laziness of nobility, there is genuine dignity in the confession of Vincente Espinel's Picaro: "My name is Marcos de Obregon, and I am ignorant of any skill; for hidalgos do not acquire such things, and rather endure misery and servitude than work as craftsmen." Characteristically enough, the only likable partner whom Lazarillo finds in his roving is the utterly pauperized and declassed hidalgo who, with an empty stomach and only one extra shirt, creates for himself a completely fictitious life of elegance, romance, and high distinction. To be sure, he is a fool, but it is the only instance where our laughter and the author's cease to be bitter and are mellowed by respect, compassion, even love.²⁰ This contempt of the vulgar

of Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*, whose affinity to the "Spanish temper," the Quixotic in particular, is obvious enough. About the connection between Thomas Mann and Laurence Sterne, cf. my article "Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* and Thomas Mann's *Joseph the Provider*," *MLQ*, VIII (1947), 101-18.

¹⁹ Ludwig Pfandl, *Geschichte der spanischen Literatur in ihrer Blütezeit* (Freiburg, 1929), p. 267.

²⁰ Here is the germ from which, out of the same soil, just half a century later, the most lovable "fool" of all world literature was to emerge, the most magnificent image of human dignity growing out of an *idée fixe*. When F. M. Warren, in his *History of the Novel* (New York, 1908), writes that the picaresque genre "was a protest against the predominance in literature of the aristocratic type" (p. 289), he states but a surface truth and fails to see the more complex

business and utilitarianism of life is truly aristocratic, and only a pedant without any sense of humor can fail to detect the dignity in this refusal to be useful and practical, and call this attitude by the harsh name of laziness. The lazy little rascal knows perfectly well why the most beneficial activity, the only "activity" in which he indulges, is sleep. It shuts him off from the indecent hustle and bustle, and strengthens his inner forces so that he can resist the crude and vulgar onslaught of reality. It is the same aristocratic attitude which makes Felix Krull proudly confess his phlegmatic disposition and chronic sleepiness (15).

Both the picaresque novel and *Felix Krull* signalize, unconsciously or consciously, the decay of an established order, of a world which tenaciously clings to the appearance of greatness while its real substance, its real greatness, are gone. They are books of farewell, of a rather cruel farewell, convinced that what is destined to fall should be helped along with a strong, merciless push. In spite of the laughter they aim to arouse, they are basically melancholy, even pessimistic books,²¹ and it was a profound inner necessity which led Thomas Mann, when immersed in the pranks of his mountebank, to his two most pessimistic creations, the stories of a frightening human breakdown, of the invasion of a precious and highly developed culture by the sinister forces of a barbaric and demonic underworld. The *Picaro* is the offspring of twilight, yet negative as his character may be, it contains enormous potentialities of rebirth. He is a creature of nihilism, but he is already the bridge which will lead beyond the abyss. The Spanish *Picaro* carries the hopeful message of the sheer force of survival, come what may, the cheerful promise that, even if an empire may reel and founder, the cheating, thieving, begging rascal will outlast every possible disaster. This stubborn animalistic endurance holds a guarantee, just as Felix's ability to create a "world" out of his imagination holds a guarantee, once the old and sluggish world is defeated by jokes and trickery. If Felix's existence is developed to the bitter end, Gustav Aschenbach and Adrian Leverkühn must appear on the scene. But if Felix's existence is developed beyond the end, if it is possible to turn the *Picaro*'s "freedom from" into a "freedom to," if man's ingenuity joins in a covenant with the highest creativeness, with God and his universe, if *ad maiorem gloriam hominis* becomes indistinguishable from *ad maiorem gloriam Dei*, then a new day of mankind will break, then the *Schelmenroman*

and profound connotation of this type of literature. By the same token, *Don Quijote* is on the surface level nothing but a travesty of the Amadis novel, yet who could fail to see that the overtly ridiculous *idée fixe* of knighthood is, at the same time, the hidden source of the hero's true nobility? This thought has been most sensitively developed by Thomas Mann in his *Don Quijote* essay, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

²¹ Ludwig Pfandl, *op. cit.*, p. 278, states quite correctly: "Pessimism is the key-note of the true *novela picaresca*," although he arrives at this definition rather by intuition than by concrete demonstration.

will transform itself into a divine *Schelmenroman*, and Felix's name will change to Joseph.

There can be no doubt that, in Thomas Mann's biblical Joseph, the Picaro has found his most elevated and most elevating revival. All the elements are here; yet what once was a bitter jest has now turned into "God's own jest." There is all the cheating, the double-crossing, the aloofness, the aristocratic arrogance, the "twinkling with the eye," the playacting, the *corriger la fortune*, the shrewd self-promotion, the "down" into the pit and the "up" to the highest heights, the travels into a "phantasmagoric" fairyland, the glib and golden tongue, the naïveté that is devilishly clever, the aloneness of the "orphan" who is torn from his father's breast and sold into servitude. Yet all of it is the fulfillment of a great plan, the plan God has for man and the world, and it is man who consciously helps God to carry out His plan; because a covenant has been concluded to which man remains basically true, notwithstanding the little cheating, a highly beneficial cheating, which he has to do to promote God in the world. Felix Krull, justified, i.e., blessed by and in alliance with the highest authority—that is the story of *Joseph und seine Brüder*.

It begins with Abraham, the patriarch, who creates his God out of "arrogance," the very highest possible God, because so great is this man's "impertinence" that he is willing only to serve the very highest, the God of all Gods. From him issues a whole tribe of rascals, shrewd outwitters of reality, realizers of great dreams, yet their schemes and their dreams are signs of their being chosen, true children of the Spirit which through them plays a trick on heavy, stupid, and soulless matter. Jacob cheating his brother out of his birthright, becoming prosperous and "heavy" by cleverly manipulating nature and forcing her to give him an undue share of Laban's sheep herds—he is truly a divine rogue, and the word "rogue," so constantly applied to him by Pharaoh in his conversation with Joseph, assumes the dignity of a title of honor. He takes "liberties" with the established order of things, because he is free, yet free under the covenant, most sensitively aware of the great pattern which he has to fill, not being stupidly and passively lived by life, but taking it into his hands and, by a willful course of conduct, fulfilling the will of the Highest. To play one's role consciously within God's great scheme—that is man's highest destiny, to arrange and handle freely the dicta and data of the world and yet to listen obediently to what God wants with us and with Himself. To fulfill a covenant by "promoting" oneself—and the one can be achieved only through the other—that is the point where the highest human freedom and man's strictest submission coincide.

Joseph's whole career is the story of promotion and fulfillment. It is the most roguish mixture of mischievousness and innocence,

and when he dreams his arrogant dreams, manipulated and true at the same time, Reuben cannot help thinking: "Mischievous in innocence, and innocent in mischief, so that the innocence becomes dangerous and the mischief holy, these are the unmistakable signs of the blessing, and there is nothing to be done against it, even if one wanted to, but one does not want to, really, because here is God."²² It is not accidental that Hermes, the god of the "promoters," wayfarers, and thieves plays such a prominent role in Thomas Mann's biblical story. He is, on a divine level, young Joseph's "Professor" Schimmelpreester, even if his name is Eliezer, the "oldest" servant, who, at the most decisive point of his career (which is not "his" career anyway, but the reenactment of an old and hallowed pattern), ran so fast that you would think he had little wings on his feet and his cap. The winged god appears again, half seducer, half saving guide, when Joseph travels to his brothers to meet his outrageous fate. It is on this ominous trip that Joseph himself takes on the features of Hermes, a frail little messenger with a hooded cape and a papyrus scroll, and it is not at all startling that Thomas Mann has nicknamed the career of his biblical hero the story of "an American Hermes."²³

Blessed roguishness, roguishness under the blessing, a most beneficial, dream-born manipulation of reality—that is Joseph's mission, it is the mission of the "new man"—yet who could fail to discover the delightful resemblance to Felix Krull's *Hochstapelei*? Joseph's fabulous rise to the highest office in Egypt is a series of self-promoting covenants, with the major-domo Mont-kaw, with Potiphar, with Pharaoh himself. They all are only the conscious "filling-out" of the great covenant which Abraham concluded with God to help Him by helping himself. After the last battle, the conquest of Pharaoh, is won, the ruler's mother succinctly characterizes Joseph's scheming:

"Fiddlesticks," she said impatiently, "you have plotted the whole thing and talked yourself under his skin from your very first word on. You needn't play the innocent child for me. . . . I do not have anything against politics. . . . I do not reproach you for having made good use of your hour."²⁴

Surely, all this is "morally-aesthetically acceptable only from the vantage point of the divine *Schelmenroman*."²⁵ And from this vantage point only, Joseph's proudest feat, his feeding of and providing for the starving world, is acceptable. Forewarned by a dream, he outwits nature, making the seven fat years relatively lean, in order to make the following seven lean years relatively fat. It is the most grandiose and triumphant stroke of *corriger la fortune* in the career of a Picaro. It is not by chance that the chapter which describes Joseph's agrarian policy and reform, his shrewd scheme of hoarding and distributing, is headed "Of the Roguish Servant." Here is the counter-

²² *Der junge Joseph* (Berlin, 1934), p. 135.

²³ Introduction to the new edition of *Der Zauberberg* (Stockholm, 1945).

²⁴ *Joseph der Ernährer* (Stockholm, 1943), p. 234.

²⁵ Cf. footnote 4.

part of Krull's devastating "political" game with the stubborn and sheepish military commission. As in the case of Krull's greatest achievement, the joke is so delightful that the Egyptians and all the people of the world whom the great Provider feeds are almost split with laughter.

Full of bewitching charm seemed to them the meeting of precaution and evil, that is: the way the Provider of Shadow played a trick on the evil, drew from it profit and gain, made it subservient to ends which would never have occurred to the honestly stupid and to the ogre only out for destruction—full of bewitching charm, incredibly funny and arousing immense laughter.²⁶

Thus in Joseph the highest potentialities of the Picaro are fulfilled and exhausted. Picaro, ennobled to the point where he becomes the representative of the Third Humanism, has cast the bridge over the abyss from which he emerged. It is quite understandable that Thomas Mann, when playing for a while with the idea of finishing the "confessions" of his cheat, came to the conclusion that "the continuation of Krull . . . was superannuated and superseded by the Joseph-cycle."²⁷ Yet the disrespectful rascal has not ceased to exert his fascination on his author. There are recent reports that Thomas Mann is now working again at his picaresque novel. We do not know which potentialities Thomas Mann's Picaro may yet contain beyond his resurrection as Joseph on the one hand and Gustav Aschenbach and Adrian Leverkühn on the other. If the fragment is ever finished, the writer to whom German literature owes its greatest realistic novel (*Buddenbrooks*), the most exciting revival of the *Bildungsroman* (*Der Zauberberg*), the most modern re-creation of the historiomythological novel (*Joseph und seine Brüder*) will have given us the great picaresque novel of our century as well. He will then in his own work have demonstrated creative activity as the variation of an old pattern, new beginnings as the continuation of an age-hallowed tradition. He will have proved as the great writer's task what he considers man's highest task altogether: to activate and regenerate the eternal essence of our heritage.

Ohio State University

²⁶ *Joseph der Ernährer*, pp. 568 ff.

²⁷ *Die Entstehung des Dr. Faustus*, p. 24.

A NOTE ON GOETHE AND FRANCIS BACON

By JOHN HENNIG

In the chapter on Francis Bacon in his book *Goethe's Knowledge of English Literature* Dr. Boyd said: "Very little information is available as to which works Goethe actually read. The poem *Baco* is the only work Bacon seems to have inspired." Then follows a brief survey of opinions on Bacon expressed by Goethe in his correspondence.¹ There is no reference to the fact that in Goethe's *Geschichte der Farbenlehre* one of the largest chapters is devoted to Bacon, containing a lengthy translation from Bodley's letter, that Bacon is referred to in the passages from Sprat's history of the Royal Society translated in the chapter "Naturwissenschaften in England," and that the chapter "Innere Mängel der Societät" begins with a masterly description of Bacon (Weimar ed., II, iii, 226-43, and iv, 11 ff.; see also the *Anzeige und Übersicht zur Farbenlehre*, *ibid.*, iv, 400). Moreover, Kalischer unearthed (*ibid.*, V, ii, 255-65) a large number of paralipomena on Bacon, which shows us from what sources and by what methods Goethe compiled his history of the theory of colours and how he acquired and digested information on British scientists. These paralipomena are extracts from a review of Bacon's works in the *Journal des Sçavans* (see WE, III, vii, 267), I, 303, extracts from *Novum Organum* (in particular from I, lxxi to lxxvi), various short notes and remarks, and an extensive plan of a chapter on Bacon, including much biographical matter. The abundance of Goethe's knowledge of and ideas on Bacon may be gauged from the fact that only very few of these paralipomena were used directly in the passages on Bacon in the *Geschichte der Farbenlehre*.

Regarding Dr. Boyd's statement that "very little information is available as to which works Goethe actually read," it may be pointed out that in his Bacon chapter Goethe at the very outset referred no less than five times to Bacon's *Schriften*, also in the beginning of the subsequent chapter, naming in particular his "Tractat von den Winden," and that in the chapter "Innere Mängel der Societät" he translated a passage from Bacon's *Nova Atlantis*. E. v. Keudell has since informed us that in May, 1805, Goethe borrowed from the Weimar Library Bacon's *Nova Atlantis* (in Joseph Hall's *Mercurius Britannicus* [Utrecht, 1643]), and in October, 1807, and again in December, 1828, the Frankfurt 1665 edition of *Opera omnia philosophica* and the Dijon 1799 French translation, keeping the former in particular, on both occasions, for more than a year.

In the *Geschichte der Farbenlehre* no one, not even Newton, gave

¹ To these may be added the description of Bacon as "das Haupt aller Philister" reported by Riemer (*Gespräche*, October 1, 1807).

Goethe greater scope than did Bacon for developing his own ideas on scientific personality. Even without going into scientific details, the importance of Goethe's remarks on this subject alone would justify a close literary study of the passages relating to Bacon in the *Geschichte der Farbenlehre*. While these passages are among those usually not curtailed in the editions of Goethe's works, the paralipomena seem to have escaped the attention of both scientific and literary students of Goethe. Still, Goethe's criticism, contained in these notes, of Bacon's conceptions of experiment and induction is simply a fundamental treatise on natural science, which shows how deeply Dilthey was indebted to Goethe. What Goethe said on his conception of *Idee* in these paralipomena has never been discussed in connection with his famous controversy with Schiller. Sentences such as "Die Ordnung, in welche wir die Dinge stellen, liegt nicht in den Dingen selbst" are obviously of greatest significance to the study of Goethe's relationship with Kant. The significance of these paralipomena to our own age and the present position of science may be illustrated by two quotations:

Aber uns, die wir an die Zeit gebunden sind, die wir alles, was wir als eins, als simultan erkennen, in der Succession als ein Vieles behandeln müssen, wird durch die Idee ein Leitfaden gereicht, daß wir, wir mögen uns an einer Stelle befinden wo wir wollen, uns an den Anfang und an das Ende finden können.

Es gehört große Bildung dazu um einzusehen was vor uns geschehen ist. Eine noch größere was neben uns geschieht. Die höchste reicht nicht in die Einsicht der Zukunft. (V, ii, 260)

Even when we accept the narrowest definition of the term "literature," we should not wish to miss in a chapter on Goethe's knowledge of Bacon his reference to Bacon's "große mächtige colossale Natur" and "revolutionair anarchische Gesinnung" nor the final masterly summary of the paralipomena:

Baco von Verulam:

Vorzügliche Menschen wirken schädlich, neben dem vielen Guten was sie hervorbringen, indem sie ins Allgemeine als Individuen wirken. Durch jenes entbinden sie die Menschheit, durch dieses ziehn sie die Welt zur Form ihrer eigenen bedingten Persönlichkeit zusammen. Eine solche Stempelung dauert besonders in frühern Zeiten sehr lange fort.

It is interesting though that, apart from the biographical matter (V, ii, 261), Francis Bacon contributed comparatively little to Goethe's knowledge of England. Bodley's letter was in Latin (Bacon's letter to Bodley, see *Works* [1778], III, 228). *Novum Organum* was, of course, studied in Latin (the teaching on the *idola*, V, ii, 263 f.).² The translation from *Nova Atlantis* was from the Latin, as

² "Baco's kleines Tractätchen *de Idolis*; Εἰδωλεῖς, von den Trugbildern und Gespenstern" was referred to in Goethe's conversation with Boisserée of October 3, 1815 (Biedermann, III, 250; in the index, in spite of Goethe's warning not to

may easily be seen when we compare the beginning: "Wir haben zwölf Gesellen, um uns Bücher, Materialien und Vorschriften zu Experimenten anzuwerben" with

[Latin text]

qui libros, materias et exemplaria
experimentorum ad nos perferunt

[English text]

who bring us the books, and abstracts,
and patterns of experiments,

or the translation of the sentence "qui in artem non coaluerunt" by "die noch nicht zu einer Einheit zusammengefloßen" (English: "which are not brought into arts"), incidentally a very important source of the modern distinction between *Geisteswissenschaften* and *Naturwissenschaften*.

In my papers on Goethe's interest in British mineralogy, meteorology, and botany,³ I have shown that, due to the omission of Goethe's scientific works, Dr. Boyd has given us an incomplete picture of Goethe's knowledge of English literature. It is hoped to illustrate this point even more forcibly by a study of Goethe's interest in British physics, a subject sorely neglected in the traditional discussions on Goethe and Newton.⁴ The present note is confined to the literary point of view, which in the case of Francis Bacon seemed to be predominant.

Sutton, Co. Dublin

confuse Roger and Francis Bacon [*ibid.*, II, 243], listed under the former's name).

³ "Goethe's Interest in British Mineralogy," *Mineralogical Journal* (June, 1949); "Goethe's Interest in British Meteorology," *MLQ*, IX (1949), 321-37; "Goethe's Interest in British Botany," *Trans. Linnaean Society of London* (1949).

⁴ See my paper "Goethe's Interest in the History of British Physics," to be published soon in *Isis*.

LA CHARTREUSE DE PARME: THE PROBLEM OF COMPOSITION

By A. LYTTON SELLS

I

How has it come about that the *Chartreuse de Parme*, which was hailed on its appearance as a masterpiece "où le sublime éclate de chapitre en chapitre," should have inspired from the outset the strongest reservations as to its composition? If it is not the greatest of Stendhal's novels, it is the one into which he put most of himself, of his memories, of the things he loved or despised; and it is the one which appeals to a wider circle of readers than the more technically excellent *Le Rouge et le Noir*. In such a novel, the problem of composition cannot but be a major problem. Balzac raised it, courteously but firmly, in the latter part of his famous article;¹ and though many subsequent critics have glanced at the problem, it has never been solved in a manner intellectually satisfying; nor—where it would seem that the novel was indeed faultily constructed—has the reason for this blemish been explained.

In his article in the *Revue parisienne*, Balzac devoted to the *Chartreuse* the most thoroughgoing analysis to which it has perhaps ever been subjected. After describing it as "le roman que Machiavel écrirait s'il vivait banni de l'Italie au dix-neuvième siècle,"² he begins by analyzing the plot and the characters in detail, and it is evident that he is mainly interested in the Prince, in Mosca, Ferrante Palla, and above all the Sanseverina. Her passion reaches the "sublime." Then he begins to consider the defects. "Si j'ai trouvé de la confusion à la première lecture, cette impression sera celle de la foule, et dès lors évidemment le livre manque de méthode."³ The two opening chapters should have been omitted, and the story should have begun with the description of Waterloo. The details regarding the Del Dongo family and Milan—"tout cela n'est pas dans le livre." The action should have been concentrated in Parma, and the episode of the abbé Blanès and the belfry at Griante should have disappeared;

La loi dominatrice est l'unité dans la composition; que vous placiez cette unité soit dans l'idée mère, soit dans le plan, sans elle il n'y a que confusion. Donc, en dépit du titre, l'ouvrage est terminé quand le comte et la comtesse Mosca rentrent à Parme,⁴ et que Fabrice est archevêque.⁵

¹ H. de Balzac, "Etudes sur M. Bayle," *La Revue parisienne*, September 25, 1840, in *Œuvres diverses* (Paris, 1940), III, 374.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, p. 401.

⁴ Chap. 23. But the Sanseverina does not agree to become the Contessa Mosca until Chap. 27.

⁵ Chap. 25. It is evident that Balzac regarded the novel as ended at this point.

Thus the three concluding chapters are useless. Had Stendhal wished to tell the love story of Fabrice and Clélia, to write "la vie de ce jeune homme," then "Fabrice aurait dû ne pas se trouver primé par des figures aussi typiques, aussi poétiques⁶ que le sont les Princes, la Sanseverina, Mosca, Palla Ferrante [*sic*]."⁷

Technically speaking, Balzac was right. Much as his taste has been disparaged, he was a far more practiced novelist than Stendhal, and had more aesthetic acumen. Whether one shares his conception of the "poétique" or not, his view of composition is incontrovertible.

Francisque Sarcey, writing in 1883, recognized, with Balzac, that there was a division of interest in the book: "Il ne faut point chercher dans la *Chartreuse de Parme* un roman bien composé où Fabrice, figure prédominante, ramène autour de lui tous les éléments d'une seule et même action."⁸ One notices that, for Sarcey, Fabrice was the "figure prédominante," or should have been; for Balzac, it was the Sanseverina. These are the two extreme views of the novel from the standpoint of moral preference; from the aesthetic standpoint Balzac and Sarcey are at one.

Of the many other judgments which have been pronounced on this novel, from the time of Taine to the thirties of the present century, space does not permit us to speak. Pierre Jourda admits that it was a work "qui se permettait la plus libre composition et la plus embrouillée."⁹ Henri Martineau reminds us of the speed with which it was written, of the fact that "cela glaçait [Stendhal] que de suivre un plan," and speaks with appreciation of the book's "charmant abandon."¹⁰ It would seem wise not to go further. Yet this is precisely what M. Maurice Bardèche appears to have done in perhaps the most elaborate justification of Stendhal's procedure yet attempted.

Comparing him with Balzac, he notes that for the latter "un romancier était un technicien" and that there was "un art poétique du roman." But a novel by Stendhal is "ce qui se prête le plus mal à cet étalonnage."¹¹ He goes on to observe that Stendhal was unaware of an "art poétique du roman" and never interested himself in the "savante montée dramatique qui conduit à la crise. . . . Car la *Chartreuse* n'est pas un *drame*, comme Balzac voulait que le fût tout roman c'est une *vie*. C'est admirablement fait comme *vie*, non comme *drame*. Et l'unité du roman est une *unité de personnage*, si l'on peut dire, et non une *unité d'action*."¹² But one may observe here that there are excellently constructed novels of which the unity is supplied

⁶ An interesting revelation of Balzac's notion of the poetical.

⁷ Balzac, *op. cit.*, III, 401-02.

⁸ Cited by Jean Méliat, *Stendhal et ses commentateurs* (Paris, 1911), pp. 248-49.

⁹ *La Chartreuse de Parme*, texte établi et présenté par Pierre Jourda (Paris: Les Textes français, 1933), I, xxxiii.

¹⁰ Martineau, *L'Œuvre de Stendhal* (Paris, 1945), pp. 469, 474-77.

¹¹ Bardèche, *Stendhal romancier* (Paris, 1947), p. 410.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 416-17.

mainly by a "life": such are Maupassant's *Une Vie* and James's *Portrait of a Lady*. Even *Dominique*, despite its faults, has far more unity than the *Chartreuse*. Moreover, as I shall show, the lack of "unité de personnage" is probably the major defect in the *Chartreuse*. M. Bardèche also declares that "Stendhal a inventé par hasard le découpage du cinéma." This may indeed be so, but it does not prove that his "manière de conter" is good; for what makes an excellent film may make a poor novel, and vice versa. At the same time these reflections compel us, in justice, to recall the circumstances in which the *Chartreuse* was written.

II

On August 16, 1838, it occurred to Stendhal that he might make a *romanzetto* out of the chronicle entitled *Origine della grandezza della famiglia Farnese*. But, as he thought it over, he decided on September 3 to transpose the characters into Italians of his own day and change what would otherwise have been no more than an adaptation into a novel of politics and intrigue in early nineteenth-century Lombardy. Meanwhile, however, he had met the Countess Montijo and her young daughters. He talked to them about the *grandezza* of Napoleon and so one day conceived the idea of writing for the little girls a description of Waterloo.¹³ He began this on September 1 and worked two days on it; and we now know, thanks to Paul Arbelet,¹⁴ that this—*mirabile dictu*—was actually the story of Fabrice carried down to the point in the battle where "le général Comte A*" takes his horse. He then left the story, probably because on September 3 he suddenly saw that he could fuse it with the story of Alessandro Farnèse, which he now decided to modernize.¹⁵ What then happened is recorded in a curious note which he afterwards made in a copy of the first edition:

The Chart made 4 novembre 1838—26 décembre, id. The 3 septembre 1838 I had the idea of the Char. I began after a tour in Brittany, I suppose, or to the Havre. I began the 4 nov. till the 26 X^{bre}. The 26 déc. I send the 6 énormes cahiers to Kol for les faire voir to the bookseller.

By this amusing jargon we are to understand that the *Chartreuse*, conceived in outline on September 3 and possibly meditated at odd moments during September and October, was dictated in its entirety between November 4 and December 26, when the author handed it to Romain Colomb, who was to offer it to a publisher. It was composed far too quickly and this accounts in part for its defects.

Il faut du temps: le temps a part
A tous les chefs-d'œuvre de l'art,

¹³ Hence the cabalistic note at the end of Chap. 3 of the *Chartreuse*: "Para v. P. y E. 15 x 38," which Paul Hazard interpreted as "Para usted [i.e., Countess Montijo], Paquita y Eugenia, 15 décembre 1838." The early story of Fabrice was therefore written for the future Empress of the French.

¹⁴ "Du nouveau sur la *Chartreuse*," *Figaro*, September 10, 1938.

¹⁵ Martineau, *op. cit.*, pp. 463-67.

said La Fontaine; and Flaubert might have echoed his words. But the defects of the novel were also implicit in the fusion of the chronicle with the tale of Waterloo; in the chronicle itself, from which Stendhal could not bring himself to depart; in Stendhal's own character; and, as I shall try to show, in the physical and mental condition in which he found himself in 1838. In the *avant-propos* of *Lamuel*, which he wrote on May 25, 1840, he declared:

Je ne fais point de plan. Quand cela m'est arrivé, j'ai été dégoûté du roman par le mécanisme que voici: je cherchais à me souvenir en écrivant le roman, de choses auxquelles j'avais pensé en écrivant le plan, et, chez moi, le travail de la mémoire éteint l'imagination. La page que j'écris me donne l'idée de la suivante: ainsi fut faite la *Chartreuse*.

A little later in the first draft of a letter to Balzac which he drew up on October 16, 1840, to thank him for his review, he wrote: "je n'avais jamais songé à l'*art* de faire un roman. J'avais fait dans ma jeunesse quelques plans de romans, et écrivant des plans me glace."¹⁰ This is sincere. He confesses that the lack of design in his novel is due to a defect in nature; but behind all this one suspects a weakening of the faculties.

The *Chartreuse de Parme* is not only the least well composed of all Stendhal's great novels; it also displays a cleavage of interest, a departure from emotional unity, which would have seriously impaired a work less instinct with genius. The reader's sympathy is divided between the fortunes of Count Mosca and the Countess Gina which, after some apparently irrelevant adventures of Fabrice, first hold the stage; and the story of Fabrice and Clélia which only really begins in the fifteenth chapter of a novel containing twenty-eight. The first is a story of politics, passion, and vengeance; the second is among the greatest of all love stories, one of the most moving and pathetic, a modern counterpart of the tale of Tristan and Iseult. Though the two plots are often brilliantly interwoven, there is, nevertheless, a lack of artistic unity and—to use a convenient Gallicism—the two stories "swear with each other" in a manner which towards the end is absolutely distressing.

Why did Stendhal begin by accounting for Fabrice's birth and character (at inordinate length) and then narrating his childhood, his escapade at Waterloo, and his first meeting with Clélia Conti, only to introduce the fascinating Count Mosca and lead us to forget Clélia in our interest in the Countess Gina, who is soon to become the Sanseverina? Because he had not planned his novel. The result would have been less vexatious, if he had not subsequently launched the love affair of Fabrice and Clélia, and engaged our sympathies so utterly in their cause as to alienate them from the Sanseverina at a time when she is passing through the cruellest agonies of mind and is displaying to the utmost the "sublimity" of her character. Had he spent a day or

¹⁰ *Correspondance*, ed. H. Martineau (Paris, 1934), X, 268.

two in studying the *Andromaque* in which Racine had contrived to conduct two plots side by side and to present two conflicting interests,¹⁷ but in a mode entirely harmonious and without alienating our sympathy from any of the four great protagonists, he might have learned how to construct a novel—which, in any case, is easier than a tragedy.

But not only is there a cleavage of interest; the composition is in other respects heedless and disorderly. There are episodes, and even one or two chapters,¹⁸ which could with advantage be discarded. There are chapters crammed to overflowing,¹⁹ others comparatively slight.²⁰ Stendhal introduces a significant character, brings him back in a half-hearted fashion, and then, not knowing what to do with him, consigns him to the limbo of heroes who might have been.²¹ He forgets to narrate something he should previously have mentioned, and coolly tells us so. And he moves from one group of his heroes to the other according to the caprice of the moment and without reflecting that his reader may be disoriented and may have difficulty in picking up the thread.

Among those who are least reserved in their admiration of Stendhal, the tendency has been to pass lightly over these defects, or to assume that unity of plot is not necessary in the novel, that the novel has no particular rules, or that there are as many rules as there are types of novels. Furthermore, Stendhal's merits are so unique that he is a law unto himself; he can do no wrong.

Others abide our question; thou art free.

We wonder. The conquests achieved by the novel in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the fact that the novel has in large measure annexed fields previously occupied by the epic, the heroic or narrative poem, tragedy, and even in some measure comedy, have not gone without peril. The price of universal conquest may be the loss of all distinctive character on the part of the conqueror. It is far easier to write a tolerable novel than a tolerable epic, or narrative, or philosophical poem—as one may judge from the numbers who try. Without suggesting that the novel is necessarily inferior to these great genres, one may say that in the nineteenth century it could only raise itself to their level by adopting a discipline as rigorous as theirs; if not by the invention of "rules," at least by the discovery of "laws" appropriate to its nature.

Now the French novelists were probably more conscious of this

¹⁷ There is even here an analogy in the moral situation. As Oreste loves Hermione, who loves Pyrrhus, who loves Andromaque; so Mosca loves Gina, who loves Fabrice, who loves Clélia.

¹⁸ E.g., Chaps. 1, 13.

¹⁹ Chap. 6 (32 pages in the Jourda edition).

²⁰ Chap. 10 (8 or 9 pages). It is not, however, a question of the length of a chapter, but of its content.

²¹ Chaps. 1, 3.

truth than those of any other nation. This explains the care which Flaubert gave to the construction of his plots, and also his constant preoccupation with style. It explains why the Brothers Goncourt, who were less occupied with what they called "l'affabulation du roman," were nevertheless intensely occupied with technique; why they achieved unity of interest in all their novels; and why no one carried further than they the cult of artistic writing. Maupassant, finally, was nothing if not an artist. All these writers discussed among themselves questions of *métier* and technique, and nothing was more impressive to the young Henry James when he was admitted to their circle. English, Scottish, or American novelists might be pioneers, they might invent or initiate; but it was the French who elaborated the theories and established the standards. They were the professors: to them everyone came for lessons. But for them, Henry James would not have written the perfect novels he did write; George Moore would not have repaired the astonishing deficiencies of his education; and, even at a distance, Galsworthy would not have created the greatest *roman-fleuve* in the English language.

Nor is the value of structure in the French novel less clearly recognized today than in the days of Flaubert. To admire a kind of novel which "claims to espouse life itself through devious arabesques, will always remain exceptional in France," says one of our contemporaries. "Even after Proust, Alain-Fournier, and Giraudoux, a novel to the French stands primarily in need of design. It must be dramatic and must include a minimum of narrative."²²

It is not therefore gratuitous to judge Stendhal by the standards which his countrymen have created, if we deem these standards to be founded in the nature of artistic creation—as we do.

III

What should Stendhal have done with the material he had in mind? One can imagine two alternative plans, neither of which would have involved the invention of episodes very different from those which the novel, as we have it, contains, but both of which would have been proof against the objections that have been raised.

Scenario A. He could have done what Balzac suggested and gone even further in the way of concentration.

The opening chapter, on the first French occupation of Lombardy, would have been discarded, and the story would have begun with Gina, her sympathy with the nationalist cause, and her marriage to Pietranera. Fabrice's paternity and character would have been accounted for in a few lines, and we should have seen him from the outset through the eyes of Gina. Chapter 2 would have been shorter, and the adventure at Waterloo (Chapters 3 and 4) would have been

²² Henri Peyre, "Franco-German Literary Relations," *Comparative Literature*, II (1950), 11-12.

briefly narrated by Fabrice to his aunt and mother. He would have appeared to the former as an object of fascination and disquiet, and his chance encounter with Clélia (Chapter 5) would have increased the disquiet he was causing. He would not, however, have become a leading personage, whose passions and interests might have engaged our sympathy. We should then find ourselves in Milan (Chapter 6), where Count Mosca would set the stage for the drama that is to follow. Our interest would be concentrated wholly on Mosca and on Gina, her marriage with the Duca di Sanseverina and her winning of a position at the court of Parma. Fabrice would be important only as he continued to give anxiety to the Duchess (as Gina has now become) and to inspire in Mosca alternate accesses of jealousy and relief; and thus the figures of Mosca, Gina, and the Prince, with the intrigues in which they become involved, would have stood out in all their vigor. The affair with Marietta, described at the beginning of Chapter 8, would have been linked with the continuation of this episode in Chapter 11; and thus the bulk of Chapter 8, and Chapter 9 (the return to Griante), would have been discarded, and Chapter 10 (which is slight) would have been fused with Chapter 11. The killing of Giletti would now lead (as in the novel) to Fabrice's flight from Parma and to a temporary exile; and the character and conduct of Landriani (Chapter 12) would have acquired greater prominence. But the episode of the Fausta (Chapter 13), which is frigid and useless, would have been discarded. The proceedings now initiated against Fabrice by the Duchess' enemies would lead to her intervention on his behalf (Chapter 14) and to her obtaining, "par la force de son caractère," the Prince's agreement to signing the document she requires; but Mosca's error in omitting from this document the essential words: "Cette procédure injuste n'aura aucune suite à l'avenir," would enable the Prince to escape from his undertaking and to imprison Fabrice.²³ Thus Chapter 14 (*l'audience de congé*), Chapter 16 (the crisis in the life of Gina: "Allons, *marche, malheureuse femme!* fais ton devoir; va dans le monde . . ." and "Il faut donc ici et sans délai *prendre des résolutions*"), and Chapter 17 (Mosca's projects for restoring the situation)—chapters which are of indescribable brilliance and probably unique in literature—would not have had to bear the formidable competition of Chapters 15, 18, and 19, which are of an equal but different kind of beauty and composed in a different key. Fabrice would, of course, have been imprisoned, and we should have heard of his love affair, but we should not have been allowed to feel much interest in it. He would have been compelled to escape from the Tour Farnèse and to take refuge at Belgirate; the

²³ Whichever way the story is taken, Chap. 14 contains the pivot of the action. It is, for the purposes of the plot, decided in this chapter (1) that Fabrice shall be imprisoned in the Tour Farnèse, and so shall meet and love Clélia; (2) that the Prince, by his deception of the Duchess, shall virtually sign his own death warrant.

Prince would then have been poisoned and Fabrice brought back to become coadjutor to Archbishop Landriani. Clélia would have been satisfactorily married to the devoted Crescenzi, and Fabrice would have shone as a preacher, and even perhaps as a saint. And the story would have ended, under the reign of the young Prince, with the triumph of Mosca and his new countess. The love of Fabrice and Clélia, the story of Sandrino, and the death of these three characters, would have had no place in such a novel. It would have been a life of Gina, a story of politics, passion, and vengeance.

Scenario B. Stendhal could have followed quite another plan and written a novel equally proof against criticism on the ground of faulty construction.

The story would have begun with the childhood of Fabrice, and we should then have been more interested than we are in the lack of sympathy between him and his reputed father. The character of "le lieutenant Robert" would have acquired greater importance, and as "le général Comte A*," he might have reappeared later in the story to play a decisive part in the life of his son, instead of merely depriving the latter of a horse on the field of Waterloo—a singularly pointless episode. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 would, however, have stood practically as they are; but the first meeting with Clélia (Chapter 5) would have been brought into relief by artifices of composition and style. Chapters 6 and 7 would have been retained, but toned down and abbreviated, so that Chapters 8 and 9 (the visit to Griante), 10 and 11 (the killing of Giletti and the flight across the river), and 12 (the Archbishop) would have furnished the main narrative. Chapter 13 would have been discarded, as in the other scenario. Chapter 14 (*l'audience de congé*) would have stood, but 16 and 17 would have been toned down, or we might have been left to guess what had happened in them from the subsequent conduct of the Duchess and the Count. On the other hand, Fabrice's arrest and imprisonment, and his second meeting with Clélia (beginning of Chapter 15) would have been linked up with the description of his first night in the Tour Farnèse (Chapter 18), from which it is separated in the novel by some forty pages of text. Chapters 15, 18, 19, and 20 would in this way have gained in impressiveness. The Tour Farnèse is a means not only of bringing the lovers together, but of isolating them from the outer world. It fulfills the same purpose in this novel as the Palace of Theseus for Arcita and Palemone in the *Teseida*, from which Stendhal may have drawn inspiration;²⁴ and it is surely to these chapters that a novelist might turn for lessons in technique, because they display the maximum psychological consequences which can be drawn from a given situation. Now, had these chapters been completely linked up, instead of being interrupted at the outset by the description of Gina's moral

²⁴ A. Lytton Sells, "Boccaccio, Chaucer and Stendhal," *Rivista di letteratura moderna*, settembre-dicembre, 1947, pp. 237-48.

crisis and its immediate consequences, and immediately followed by her plot with Ferrante Palla, the reader would have been able to enjoy their beauty to the full. They would not have been associated with episodes which, admirably as these are narrated, are so utterly out of keeping with their lyric tone.

At this point, let us suppose that "le général Comte A*," who since 1815 has been eating out his heart amid dreams of fallen greatness in some country retreat in the mountains above Grenoble, is warned by Fabrice's mother of the deadly peril in which their son is placed. He arrives in Parma, and with the ready wit and resource of a Brigadier Gerard²⁸—or many another Napoleonic hero—he readily effects the escape of Fabrice, and takes him off to Dauphiné. The distance of such an exile would facilitate the marriage of Clélia and Crescenzi, and the odium of this marriage could fall on General Conti, instead of on the Duchess who, with the Prince's murder on her hands, is bearing about as much as it seems advisable to place on her. Thus the narrative in Chapters 21, 22, and 23 might have been profitably modified. It is possible, down to Chapter 22, to feel some sympathy, or at least pity, for the Duchess; it would have been possible for us to retain this, had Stendhal wished. By making her intrigue for the marriage of Clélia and Crescenzi, he alienates sympathy on the part of readers who regard the story as the story of Fabrice—as Sarcy regarded it, and many another since his time. Fabrice would now have returned to Parma, as in the novel; but Chapter 24 (the burning of the papers), which Balzac so much admired, might have been abbreviated to allow Clélia's impulsive intervention in Chapter 25, when she thinks that Fabrice has eaten the poisoned food, to gain in relief. The rest of the story would have developed much as it does in the novel. In Chapter 26 the unexpected meeting of Fabrice and Clélia at the Princess' reception after Clélia's marriage, might have been rewritten. The episode is one of the most exquisite and poignant in the novel; but the reader is disconcerted by the multiplicity of physical movements and moral experiences which are described—by the shifting of the lime-light between Fabrice and Clélia—and is apt to lose his bearings: the scene could have been presented more clearly. One cannot see that Anetta Marini (Chapter 27) is of much value to the plot; at this stage a new character should have been introduced only if essential. On the other hand, the events deriving from Clélia's attendance at the sermon, the clandestine meetings in the Orangerie, the birth of Sandrino, his removal to another house, and his death, followed by the death of Clélia—all narrated in nine pages of Chapter 28—should have been developed. We should then have been spared Stendhal's awkward: "Ici, nous demandons la permission de passer, sans en dire un seul mot, sur un espace de trois années"; and we should not have had the impression that the novel had been brought to a close in response to

²⁸ In A. Conan Doyle's historical romance.

some peremptory demand from a publisher. The adventures were well conceived, and they deserved better than that. But after the death of Clélia, Fabrice might have joined his father in Dauphiné. A retreat on some high Alpine platform, from which, while awaiting the hour of death, he would have surveyed the world as from the eyrie of an eagle, would have been more appropriate to that "grande âme"—the refugee of Griante and the prisoner of the Tour Farnèse²⁰—than an old *certosa* by the banks of the Po. This story would have been a life of Fabrice, a lyrical and romantic novel, with great echoes at the beginning and the end of the destiny of Napoleon.

IV

The *Chartreuse de Parme* is not, then, a perfect novel in the sense that *Pride and Prejudice*, *Madame Bovary*, and *The Portrait of a Lady* are perfect novels; and yet it presents in its parts a richer texture of beauty, more of originality and more truths about human nature than perhaps any novel one could name. "Le côté faible de cette œuvre est le style, en tant qu'arrangement de mots. . . ." Here again Balzac had been right. The tone of the novel is too consistently plain and bare. One is conscious of a certain sameness, and even flatness, in the language and perceives that some of what should have been the greatest effects are not brought out as they might have been. There is, in brief, a lack of color and variety in the style, a lack of character and precision in the landscapes. But these defects—which we propose to examine elsewhere—were due to faults of taste and probably of temperament. The lack of unity in structure is more serious and is not so to be accounted for.

If Stendhal failed to achieve the unity of design, of interest, which good judges consider essential, this was not because he was handicapped by the chronicle. The data it furnished could have been subduced to a single pattern. His failure was, as we shall now try to prove, a symptom of his approaching end. Diseases were sapping him from within, and his mind was beginning, though only at times and for short periods, to give way. It still worked brilliantly, but unevenly—and not continuously. It had blind spots and could no longer find its bearings with confidence. Had he been handling in 1829 the material he used in the *Chartreuse* in 1838, he would have written a novel as unified in structure and interest as *Le Rouge et le Noir*, and it would have been a far better novel. But the power of direction was now leaving him.

It was soon after his establishment at Civita Vecchia in 1831 that his health had begun to give way. By 1833, not only had he a premoni-

²⁰ Professor F. C. Green shows how for Stendhal the idea of height is associated with "states of spiritual repose." Julien Sorel's visits to the cliff-top above Verrières afford an example. *Stendhal* (Cambridge, 1939), p. 302. The idea might with advantage have been introduced at the conclusion of the *Chartreuse*.

tion that he would soon "disappear," but others also believed he was going to die. In the year 1835 alone he drew up four separate wills out of the fourteen he made between 1828 and 1840. And his fears were thoroughly well founded. Gout and gravel were the least of his afflictions; he was suffering from very grave internal maladies. He strove to dominate them; but to overcome them was beyond human power. It was during this period, and when a much grimmer phase was approaching, that he composed the *Chartreuse de Parme* at break-neck speed. No wonder he could not decide which of the two plots should take precedence; no wonder he could not select, among the countless episodes that came thronging into his brain, those which were relevant and significant; no wonder the narrative sometimes bordered on the incoherent, from the multiplicity of turns which he imparted to it. In 1840 and 1841 his symptoms were taking a more serious turn: he now suffered from severe and continued headache and from amnesia. He knew he was face to face with extinction. Writing to his friend Di Fiore, in April, 1841, he said:

Je me suis aussi colleté avec le néant. . . . Migraines horribles pendant six mois; puis, quatre accès du mal que voici: Tout à coup j'oublie tous les mots français. Je ne puis plus dire: *donnez-moi un verre d'eau*. . . . Cela dure huit à dix minutes; puis, peu à peu, la mémoire des mots revient, et je reste fatigué. . . . *J'ai eu quatre suppressions de mémoire de tout français depuis un an.* [Italics mine.]²⁷

These were the inevitable symptoms of a condition which had been developing for years. No genius could stand up to such a handicap, no mind could retain hold of the wheel while this was happening. And, if we are not mistaken, it was beginning to happen when he composed the *Chartreuse*. It is this which explains the weakness of the composition, this—and not, as he tried pathetically to tell Balzac, the fact that the drawing up of a plan "left him cold." And yet even in the letter to Balzac (which he wrote three times before he was satisfied with it) he makes the revealing confession:

faire un plan me glace . . . je dicte 25 ou 30 pages, puis, la soirée arrive, et j'ai besoin d'une forte distraction: en lisant les trois ou quatre dernières pages du chapitre de la veille, le chapitre du jour me vient.²⁸

When Stendhal dedicated his novel, on the last page, "to the happy few," he was probably thinking how limited had been the sales of his previous books. The reference—if we may hazard a guess—was not to *Henry V*:

We few, we happy few, we band of brothers,

as M. Louis Gillet thought, and as M. Pierre Jourda suggests after him.²⁹ Such an allusion would be no more than verbal. It seems to us

²⁷ That is, apparently, since the spring of 1840. *Correspondance*, ed. H. Martineau, X, 330-31.

²⁸ *Correspondance*, ed. H. Martineau, X, 276.

²⁹ *La Chartreuse de Parme*, ed. Jourda, II, 343.

far more likely that Stendhal was referring to the *Vicar of Wakefield*, a novel which had for long impressed him. We are not sure that when he followed Métilde to Volterra in 1819, wearing a pair of green spectacles with the strange idea that they would conceal his identity, he was not thinking of Moses Primrose's extraordinary bargain; or that when, a little later in Milan, he thought of taking his life and composed his epitaph in advance, he was not thinking of that wonderful epitaph which Dr. Primrose (with a different object, to be sure!) composed for his wife, though still living, and set it on the mantelpiece, "where it answered several very useful purposes." For it is precisely this passage which contains the expression "the happy few." No subject, we are told, had occupied the vicar more constantly than the monogamy of the clergy;

for I maintained with Whiston that it was unlawful for a priest of the Church of England, after the death of his first wife, to take a second. . . . I published some tracts upon the subject myself, which, as they never sold [they were even less successful than Stendhal's *De l'Amour*, of which seventeen copies had sold in fourteen years, the remainder of the edition being used as ballast for a ship] I have the consolation of thinking were read only by the happy few.⁸⁰

Whether "the happy few" who read Dr. Primrose on monogamy would have been equally edified by the exploits of the Sanseverina, Stendhal would not wish us to inquire too closely.

Indiana University

⁸⁰ *Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. Cunningham (New York, 1908), III, 14.

POETIC THEMES OF PAUL ELUARD

By LEROY J. BENOIT

The school of surrealism arising in 1924 between two conflicting poetic traditions, namely, the school of *les voyants* (Saint-Pol-Roux and Lautréamont) and the inspired mysticism of Claudel and Valéry, sought to bring its own measure of balance. Drawing its code from André Breton's *Manifeste du surréalisme*, it emphasized the application of literary formulas based upon a cooperative work collated from all the arts; it advocated a theory of materialism, and a belief in the revelation of a psychic life beyond pure rationalization. This supremacy of the subconscious mind over rational thought and over the general law of movement as applied to the exterior world of human thought became the role of dreams. In this direction the surrealists shared the views of Freud because, as Breton asserts, those elements which appear so contradictory, namely, dreams versus reality, merge into an absolute reality, a *surreality*. Breton even went one step further: surrealism, he says, may be defined as a dream-thought aided by psychic automatism. This dream-thought pattern would require that the reader see "a tomato as a red balloon"; thus this automatism for the surrealists is the real function of the thought media to explain the problems of life. Obviously then, the negation of Cartesian philosophy is implied.¹

Within this poetic ambiance Paul Eluard, who was born in 1895, developed his own concept of poetry. He spent his early years of study in the Paris lycées. Fragile health later, however, compelled residence in Switzerland, where immediately before World War I he sought to recover his health in a Swiss sanatorium. Shortly afterwards he was mobilized for war service and ordered to the front. It is perhaps quite understandable, therefore, that Eluard's post-war literary inclinations should be directed towards the generation of poets of melancholia. He soon joined a group of young poets and writers who organized the review *Littérature*, which remained active during the years 1919 to 1924. By his own participation Eluard was to exercise a strong influence in molding the pattern of surrealist literature, and together with André Breton he codified their creed as follows: "Il n'y a ni formes concrètes, ni formes abstraites. Il n'y a que communication entre ce qui voit et ce qui est vu; c'est un effort de compréhension, de relation, de création. Voir, c'est com-

¹ Cf. A. E. Balakian, *Literary Origins of Surrealism* (New York, 1947). Chapter I, "Surreality," treats at considerable length the general background of this literary movement. Cf. also Wallace Fowle, "André Breton in the Age of Surrealism," *Western Review*, Vol. 14 (Fall, 1949), pp. 5-17.

prendre, juger, transformer, imaginer, être ou disparaître."² For the surrealists, Eluard asserts, a word never fully explains an object; it only gives an idea, only tenuously represents the image, and reveals only chance relationships. Language becomes most effective in suggestion through shock words. Eluard further elaborates upon surrealist technique in this way: "Il nous faut peu de mots pour exprimer l'essentiel; il nous faut tous les mots pour le rendre réel."³

In this new and bold enterprise for philosophic conversion the pictorial artists of the day eagerly joined their energies. Many of varying nationalities, such as Giorgio de Chirico, Max Ernst, Salvador Dali, and Pablo Picasso employed on their canvases their own iconographic devices for a reevaluation and reorientation process of life. Both poetry and painting, which developed spontaneously, required for comprehension of their techniques new critical values for interpretation of the mental world. It is, then, in the light of these observations that we must approach the poetic philosophy of Paul Eluard.

Eluard's first two noteworthy collections, *Mourir de ne pas mourir* of 1924 and *Capitale de la douleur* of 1926 (whose first title was *L'Art d'être malheureux*), gathered together his most significant poems and immediately marked him as the brilliant leader of the younger poets. These early verses are strongly reminiscent, however, of the transitional period from Baudelaire to Tzara. Eluard's wider purpose would nevertheless point towards a series of persistent efforts to liberate the human mind from the melancholia and spleen of Baudelaire, and to counterbalance within this sphere the destructive influences of nihilistic and dadaistic poetry.

Eluard's preoccupation is at the outset ostensibly melancholia, but it is in a measure explainable: the months of endless days passed on the sunlit veranda of a Swiss tuberculosis sanatorium, the boredom, crushing emptiness, and worry concerning a delicate constitution fostered within the patient a fatalistic outlook and a quest for mental hypnosis as an anodyne for pain. These elements have insinuated themselves into his verses. Moreover, the congealed, static quality of time, and the immobility of thought are glimpsed in such verses:

Dans un coin la voiture de verdure de l'été
Immobile glorieuse et pour toujours.⁴

In this same poem he also speaks of "mon désir immobile. . ."⁵ Thus there is created in the mind of the reader a motionless, indecisive,

² *Donner à voir* (Paris, 1939), "Essai sur Picasso." Saint-Pol-Roux is obviously a strong influence in the early poetic formation of Paul Eluard, as evidenced by the many references made to his works.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 146. Eluard amplifies upon this concept: "Je n'invente pas les mots. Mais j'invente des objets, des événements et mes sens sont capables de les percevoir. Je me crée des sentiments. . ."

⁴ "Répétitions," *Capitale de la douleur* (1926), p. 43.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

apathetic, and yet strange yearning, born of solitude. Perhaps even more than that, Eluard, in a passive state of mind, seeks to write down a rapid, stream-of-conscious, even erratic thought-pattern with the uninhibited imagery of words. Georges Hugnet, the surrealist critic, in 1926 described this quasi-somnolent element introduced into poetry by Eluard as follows: "Ce fut l'époque des sommeils . . . il s'agissait d'aller chercher au fond du sommeil hypnotique les secrètes réponses du subconscient."⁶ Salvador Dali in *Conquest of the Irrational* spoke in similar terms of the artists consumed by a burning desire to "materialize the images of concrete irrationality," and for the German painter, Max Ernst, the millennium is represented as the "total transfiguration of an object either with or without modification of its physical or anatomical appearance." Eluard himself emphasizes this dormancy of nature and the hypnosis of the individual in the following verses:

L'homme de tous les mouvements
De tous les sacrifices et de toutes les conquêtes
Dort . . .⁷

And later he speaks of "Les oiseaux repliés dans leurs ailes / Et des hommes dans le sommeil."⁸ It is apparent, then, that this physical passivity joined together with psychic activity, as elucidated by both Breton and Eluard, was to remain as the hard core of their doctrine. Dream accounts and automatic verbal texts constituted for them the most important means of expression.

In 1929 a curious incident occurred in the career of Paul Eluard, one which has given some critics considerable material for speculation. Ill with his burden of grief and lassitude, Eluard discovered an easy solution in the guise of escapism similar to that of Paul Gauguin, the artist. Eluard disappeared completely from society and the world for a period of eight months. With his wife Gala, whom he had married several years earlier, he seemed to have enjoyed perfect marital bliss, and there appeared on the surface to be little motive for his decision. Finally, in the absence of any news from him, he was presumed dead and notice to that effect in the obituary columns stunned Paris literati and friends. In reality, however, Eluard had merely departed on a strange Pacific sea voyage, leaving from Marseille, skirting the Antilles, then touching at Panama, Tahiti, Australia, Malaya, and Singapore. Eluard asserts that it was only a ridiculous adventure from which he gained "aucun profit poétique," although indications of a dreamy, tropical, exotic landscape were to pervade his poems of the later years.⁹

⁶ *Petite anthologie poétique du surréalisme* (Paris, 1934). Cf. Introduction, pp. 22-23 et *passim*.

⁷ *Capitale*, p. 49.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

⁹ For fuller treatment of this episode, cf. Louis Parrot, *Paul Eluard* (Paris, 1945).

L'Amour la poésie, which he dedicated to his wife in 1929 after his odyssey, stands out now as a work encompassing something more than the love of *one* man for *one* woman. Gala is not portrayed as a living and corporeal individual of flesh, but rather as an impersonal and ethereal universal creature, symbolizing all womanhood and the sufferings that she brings to man. We now know that Baudelaire's concept of woman as expressed in *Les Paradis artificiels* had a strong fascination for Eluard. In this work Baudelaire had stated that "la femme est l'être qui projette la plus grande ombre ou la plus grande lumière dans nos rêves. La femme est fatalement suggestive; elle vit d'une autre vie que la sienne propre; elle vit spirituellement dans les imaginations qu'elle hante et qu'elle féconde."¹⁰ Indeed Baudelaire's erotology or interpretation of love of woman as an amplification of man's sensory perceptivity in all domains gains great momentum in Eluard's poetry, finally to become the central theme even today. Just as Jeanne Duval had evoked for Baudelaire an exotic world dominated by *correspondances*, so Eluard's Nusch (Gala) will startle the sense perceptions:

Les sentiments apparents
La légèreté d'approche
La chevelure des caresses
Sans souci sans soupçon
Tes yeux sont livrés à ce qu'ils voient
Vus par ce qu'ils regardent

Confiance de cristal
Entre deux miroirs
La nuit tes yeux se perdent
Pour joindre l'éveil au désir.

(p. 19)

In crystal purity, passive and candid, woman glimpses the meanings of the Universe with vision that sharply contrasts with that of her partner, man; her omniscience surpasses in time and space the restricted mental and intuitive comprehension of the male. Her horizons, says Eluard, are universal, while those of man are sadly inhibited and often limited to purely sensual delights, which he terms "l'éveil au désir." Man then seeks his own satisfaction; woman seeks identification with the Infinite. Man must find the moral truths in the "deux miroirs" which are her eyes. Moreover, this impersonal and universal quality of woman now becomes sublimated into an idyll of time and space:

Tu as toutes les joies solaires
Tout le soleil sur la terre
Sur les chemins de ta beauté.

(p. 20)

¹⁰ *Les Paradis artificiels* (Paris, 1860), pp. 160-65 *passim*.

Despite occasional reference to poetic banalities (such as *yeux, nœuds, pièges, baisers dans les yeux*) Eluard uses more sensual images of love to make vivid the transition from the carnal to the sublime:

Tu ne m'écoutes pas
Mais ta bouche partage l'amour
Et c'est par ta bouche
Et c'est derrière la buée de nos baisers
Que nous sommes ensemble. (p. 40)

Here is, clearly articulated, man's intuition of the greater mystery which is woman and which he may hope to understand, once the sensual satisfaction is merged with the nobler realization of her eternal feminine destiny.

Even though Eluard had not completely divorced himself at this juncture in his career from melancholia, the shift is nevertheless more and more pronounced. One may still discover poems where he speaks of "les débris d'une ombre dans mon cœur" and "la tristesse aux flots de pierre" (p. 67). But more often there come optimistic messages:

Je sors des caves de l'angoisse
Des courbes lentes de la peur
Je tombe dans un puits de plumes.
(p. 95)

Two later poems of the collection present closer analogies to the erotology of Baudelaire. In them, sensory imagery encompassing tactile, auditory, visual, and olfactory sensations merge into a series of *correspondances*, and the tableau creates what Baudelaire would have termed "un roucoulement et bercement de l'esprit." The following poem is entitled "Un seul corps":

La chaleur a dénoué
La forêt nue
Il n'y a plus de forêt
Plus de voyages sur l'eau
Plus d'ombre légère aux reins
Le ciel nous est un fardeau

Notre corps est une proie
Vêtues de larmes muries
Les doigts sont des clous sanglants
Les seins tournent sur eux-mêmes
La bouche n'a que des sœurs

Il n'y a plus de fenêtre à ouvrir
Il n'y a plus de paysage
D'air pur nu d'air impur
Nos yeux reviennent à leur source
Sous la chair nue de leur beauté natale.

Ostensibly this poem represents the identification of the individual with all humanity. There is evoked in the first stanza Eluard's flight of 1929 to the Pacific sun and its islands, the peaceful background of natives squatting in the semi-obscurity of Gauguinesque settings. Then Eluard affirms that flight and escape are myths: man must face his responsibilities to an organic society. His "fardeau" is his daily existence with all its accompanying joys and tragedies, far from the "fenêtres à ouvrir" of escapism.

In another poem entitled "Le Baiser" Eluard creates, by repetitious and harmonious sounds of vowel combinations, an atmosphere of calm and voluptuousness. The mystical and ubiquitous presence of woman pervades the verses. She knows no physical frontiers; she is never disassociated from man's thoughts:

Toute tiède encore du linge annulé
Tu fermes les yeux et tu bouges
Comme bouge un chant qui naît
Vaguement mais de partout

Odorante et savoureuse
Tu dépasses sans te perdre
Les frontières de ton corps

Tu as enjambé le temps
Te voici femme nouvelle
Révélée à l'infini.

In this short poem affinity with Baudelairean verse technique is apparent, since "un chant qui naît" stresses the auditory, "Odorante et savoureuse" evokes the olfactory, and "Toute tiède encore du linge annulé" hints at the tactile. Eluard, however, breaks most sharply with Baudelaire's spleen; optimism and hope show themselves more persistently in Eluardian verse and will remain henceforth as a guiding pattern for his work. He directs his energies towards the social harmony sought by Romain Rolland and Claudel. The preoccupation with despair of his predecessors, such as Lautréamont, Tzara, and Apollinaire, now leaves him completely. Indeed, one may assert that for Paul Eluard the mission of poetry is to enfold all men and seek to translate their eternal altruism and common brotherhood.

L'aventure est pendue au cou de son rival
L'amour dont le regard se retrouve ou s'égare
Sur les places des yeux désertes ou peuplées.
(p. 102)

Like Hugo and Alfred de Vigny, Eluard conceives of his art as the framework for inspired messages directed to society for guidance:

Je suis au cœur du temps et je cerne l'espace
Un nouvel astre de l'amour se lève de partout.
(p. 111)

Thus, in surrealist imagery, Paul Eluard defends unanimism as valid, but he retains his privilege of externalizing poetic association far beyond the things which are always materially tangible:

Tous les yeux se font face et des regards égaux
Partagent le merveille d'être en dehors du temps.
(p. 120)

Eluard's most surrealist collection of poetry is *La Rose publique*.¹¹ Here the reader meets a long series of love stanzas in which happiness and confidence, although restrained and serious in tone, stand as an overt break with themes of his earlier works. To the carelessness and even temporary violence of his first poems, there now succeed anxiety, gentleness, concern, and pity. He makes secret confessions to his readers, and often they assume the shape of resolutions that never materialized. In a short poem, "Comme deux gouttes d'eau," he evokes a former convalescence at the Swiss hospital amid the snow-covered landscapes upon which familiar silhouettes stand out. Then the scene quickly shifts to remembrances of Singapore and his escape from himself. The language is extremely musical and limpid, prompting Francis Poulenc to adapt many of these poems to music.

From 1936 to 1942 Eluard's work gained great richness and measure from social and economic circumstances beyond his immediate personal preoccupation. This next phase marks a strong philosophic conversion towards Communism for the poet. In 1936 Eluard was invited to Spain to give a series of lectures on his friend Pablo Picasso. It was Spain of the Civil War that he saw and felt. In Madrid he met Federico Garcia Lorca, whose untimely death before a firing squad affected him deeply. This tragedy to the world of letters inspired Eluard to become Garcia Lorca's literary prophet in France where he has since made the Spanish poet's work popular. The later sequence of events in Spain moved Eluard's poetry toward a wider social pattern; poets, he asserted, must descend from their ivory towers. The poet's purpose in society was stated in his *Evidence poétique* in 1936:

Le temps est venu où tous les poètes ont le droit et le devoir de soutenir qu'ils sont profondément enfoncés dans la vie des autres hommes, dans la vie commune. Au sommet de tout, comme ailleurs, pour celui qui voit, le malheur défait et refait sans cesse un monde. . . .¹²

Poetry, then, must help men to liberate themselves from social injustice and unite them in a common cause for freedom; it must inspire all men with a divine spark: "Le poète est celui qui *inspire*, bien plus que celui qui est inspiré." This inspiration will then lead all men to destroy tyranny and iniquity. "Je veux délivrer l'immense pitié de

¹¹ Paris, 1934.

¹² *Evidence poétique* (Paris, 1936). The text quoted serves as part of a lecture which he delivered in London at a meeting of the leading European surrealists. The theme of the poet is, of course, age old in arrogating the role as seer.

ce temps sourd aux appels déchirants . . . de ce temps s'envelissant sous les ruines de la liberté."¹³ Later in this same manifesto, Paul Eluard asks his readers to recapture "la nostalgie de la justice" through self-projection into this vista of an Eldorado which will come one day. This transition is eloquently expressed in the poem "Sans Age" in which a militant social awareness is reflected:

Nous approchons
Dans les forêts
Prenez la rue du matin
Montez les marches de la brume

Nous approchons
La terre en a le cœur crispé
Encore un jour à mettre au monde

Le ciel s'élargira
Nous en avons assez
D'habiter dans les ruines du sommeil
Dans l'ombre basse du repos
De la fatigue de l'abandon

La terre reprendra la forme de nos corps vivants
Le vent nous subira
Le soleil et la nuit passeront dans nos yeux
Sans jamais les changer

Notre espace certain notre air pur est de taille
A combler le retard creusé par l'habitude
Nous aborderons tous une mémoire nouvelle
Nous parlerons ensemble un langage sensible. . .

O mes frères perdus
Moi je vais vers la vie j'ai l'apparence d'homme
Pour prouver que le monde est fait à ma mesure

Et je ne suis pas seul
Mille images de moi multiplient ma lumière
Mille regards pareils égalisent la chair
C'est l'oiseau c'est l'enfant c'est le roc c'est la plaine

Qui se mêlent à nous
L'or éclate de rire de se voir hors du gouffre
L'eau le feu se dénudent pour une seule saison
Il n'y a plus d'eclipse au front de l'univers.

This semi-pantheistic fervor of Eluard is apparent in the image of a beneficent nature ("Le ciel s'élargira") and in the kinship of all nature's handiwork—the bird, the child, the rock, and the fields. Man is urged to throw off the yoke of the embittered and unhappy memories of the past¹⁴ and dedicate himself to communal work for "une harmonie universelle."

¹³ *Cours naturel*, ed. Sagittaire (Paris, 1938), p. 20.

¹⁴ Cf. *Donner à voir*: "J'avais chassé l'oiseau lourd de la réflexion, j'avais fait

Le Livre ouvert (1938-1944) contains Eluard's prophetic pre-war poems of which a portion composed later and written under the German occupation is entitled "Au Rendez-vous allemand." In this volume he decries the selfishness and the heedlessness of a nation unprepared for the catastrophe which was to strike. As a unifying and forceful slogan Eluard reiterates a verse which was to become a watchword in his poetry: "La seule mort, c'est la solitude."¹⁵ Indeed, he says, no man is alone, and no one bears his suffering in silence; rather does man's plight become the mutual burden of all. His concern for others goes far beyond the mere land barriers of one country to approach Gidean internationalism. Eluard says:

Aux murmures aux cris à la source au sommet
Je te réponds mon amour sans limites. (p. 52)

Deceived and lulled, the France of 1938 soon lived through the bitter, terrified moments of 1939 and 1940, during which she was physically and morally too weak and stunned to react. The growth of the Maquis forces in 1941 ushered in a period of history filled with the exploits of brave and hunted men whose stories are even now being recorded. As a movement it projected 46-year-old Eluard into the limelight of Resistance leaders, and spread his fame far beyond the poetry-loving world. He developed his energies as a writer of vitriolic tracts against the excesses of the Nazis in France.¹⁶

In Paris he became the clandestine printer of his own verse, and in the Massif Central he was his own journalistic errand boy. By sustained and relentless activity he struck the Germans some hard blows, succeeding, with Malraux, Vercors, Aragon, Sartre, and Camus, in stirring France to underground warfare against the enemy. Some of the poems in this collection, recalling the themes of d'Aubigné's *Tragiques*, have already lost their literary appeal, since they are replete with factionalism and invective. Others, however, highlight nostalgic memories of *la douce France*, reveling in her former glory and freedom; this she must regain by conquering "the night" which everywhere hangs heavy. In a poem entitled "Patience" Eluard asks for vengeance not only against the occupying power, but against the French collaborationists as well. France is depicted as an unhappy land living in darkness, fear, and moral defeatism:

Le soleil des champs croupit
Le soleil des bois s'endort
Le ciel vivant disparaît
Et le soir pèse partout.¹⁷

(p. 191)

prisonnière l'agitation des heures et des saisons. J'enterrais gaiement mon passé dans la tombe de mon avenir" (p. 35); also, "Notre amour c'est l'amour de la vie, le mépris de la mort" (p. 22).

¹⁵ *Le Livre ouvert* (Paris, 1947), p. 48.

¹⁶ Eluard's first collection of anti-Nazi poetry appeared in this volume under the title "Sur les pentes inférieures," and then shortly after in *Le Lit-la table*.

¹⁷ This imagery of a series of suspended tableaux in nature evokes T. S. Eliot's "when the evening is spread out against the sky. . . ."

Louis Aragon had inspired Frenchmen with his *Crève-Cœur* and *Les Yeux d'Elsa*. Eluard likewise asks all to remember the past moments of blue skies and of smiles upon people's lips. He calls it the moment when "Le ciel est sur tes lèvres" (p. 181).

The battle-cry of the Resistance movement originated in a brief poem, poetically traditional in tone, simple, lucid, and yet intensely moving, which explores the thoughts before death of a young Resistance adherent. The latter is comforted by the knowledge that he dies only physically before the German rifles, but that he will live on within that brotherhood of countless others spurred by a common battle. This poetic gem, broadcast by the British Broadcasting Corporation, and dropped within France by the Royal Air Force in millions of copies, had wide vogue among Frenchmen of all social classes. Its language was intelligible, its sentiment was within the scope of basic human comprehension, and its message centered about national unity.

La nuit qui précéda sa mort
Fut la plus courte de sa vie
L'idée qu'il existait encore
Lui brûlait le sang aux poignets
Le poids de son corps l'éccœurant
Sa force le faisait gémir
C'est tout au fond de cette horreur
Qu'il a commencé à sourire
Il n'avait pas un camarade
Mais des millions et des millions
Pour le venger. Il le savait
Et le jour se leva pour lui.¹⁸

The theme of national unity under the yoke is also manifest in "A Celle dont ils rêvent," which incorporates a eulogy of France and its people. But it urges in addition that all Frenchmen rise above the shame of their own self-condemnation for their miseries. France, says Eluard, is a bountiful land:

Un pays où le vin chante
Où les moissons ont bon cœur
Où les enfants sont malins
Où les vieillards sont plus fins
Qu'arbres à fruits blancs de fleurs
Où l'on peut parler aux femmes . . .
Mais garde nous notre honte
D'avoir pu croire à la honte. . . .
(pp. 34-35)

Amidst the pessimism that was rampant in France during the occupation years, Paul Eluard persisted in his messages of fortitude and courage. He visualized the desires of human beings as simple and modest and based upon a measure of justice for all. He calls the

¹⁸ *Au Rendez-vous allemand* (Paris, 1946), p. 9.

defilers of France, the Germans, "l'ennemi à figure d'homme"; the universal misanthropist is labeled "la pierre à figure d'homme":

Nous jetons le fagot des ténèbres au feu
 Nous brisons les serrures rouillées de l'injustice
 Des hommes vont venir qui n'ont plus peur d'eux-mêmes
 Car ils sont sûrs de tous les hommes
 Car l'ennemi à figure d'homme disparaît. (p. 72)

Eluard's goal was to demonstrate the oneness of purpose of all who had been struck by the tragedy of war—its military prisoners languishing in stockades, the forced labor battalions, those damned because of religion. To all Eluard penned his messages of hope:

Nous nous sommes toujours aimés
 Et parce que nous nous aimons
 Nous voulions libérer les autres
 De leur solitude glacée. (p. 16)

This theme of solitude and its debilitating effect upon the human mind is reflected with more insistence in the post-war period. For Eluard it represents the greatest and most profound curse that can be visited upon us all, and one against which all our energies must be directed. In several poems he calls it "conquering the night" or "the escape from death"; everyone must strive to know "La douceur et le deuil de savoir qu'aujourd'hui / Nous avons tous ensemble compromis la nuit" (p. 36).

Paul Eluard has indeed grown since the termination of the war. As one of the most optimistic poets of western Europe today, he is convinced that the second global conflict of our century, instead of creating moral and intellectual disillusionment in the world, has on the contrary dispelled from the hearts of his countrymen the spectre of solitude and cowardice. The war and its winning have proved his faith in justice and have renewed man's faith in his neighbor. This theme is vividly portrayed in his collection, *Poésie ininterrompue* (1946), in which he reaffirms the mission of the poet:

Je suis le jumeau des êtres que j'aime . . .
 Ils sont très nombreux ils sont innombrables
 Ils vont par les rues pour eux et pour moi
 Ils portent mon nom je porte le leur
 Nous sommes les fruits semblables d'un arbre.¹⁹
 (p. 61)

Eluard has dedicated this volume to the "pierres à figure d'homme," since he believes that there is yet hope for them.²⁰ Grief and misan-

¹⁹ In this same volume, Eluard emphasized: "Chacun est l'ombre de tous" (p. 26).

²⁰ Eluard's definition is curious: "Je dédie ces pages à ceux qui les liront mal et à ceux qui ne les aimeront pas." Obviously, the arrow points at "des pierres à figures d'homme."

thropy for Eluard are synonymous and can easily be broken through. The poet advocates bold attack:

Je cisaillerais les ténèbres
De ma chambre qui rétrécit. . . .
(p. 51)

Where the casual reader may have entertained reservations respecting certain anomalies in Eluardian verse, especially the curious fluctuations between hope and sadness in *Capitale de la douleur*, this new collection, *Poésie ininterrompue*, stands out as the valid solution reached through experience and mature reflection. It is the most harmonious of Eluard's works. The tone and style are infinitely more varied than the earlier volumes, and it integrates his introspections and his ruminations upon the moral lessons of life. Eluard now seems to be master of his course, navigating with a clear set of guiding markers towards a definitive, yet uninterrupted, philosophy, as the title indicates. Eluard's purpose is to elicit comparisons between the eternal problems of life and then postulate answers to them: if the universe appears on the surface full of bright and sordid contrasts—society and solitude, youth and old age, the search for love and flight from death—these paradoxes are in truth only the manifestation of the interresemblance and interplay of *all* within the universe. All these elements, asserts the poet, continuously form mergings and tangencies, dynamic attractions and repulsions, and constitute in this way the great mirror of life. Eluard tells us that the key to life's riddle will be found, at least in part, in love and self-sacrifice. Resuming his belief in the predominance of female guidance, this collection stresses feminism through an erratic yet spontaneous enumeration in adjective form of all the virtues and vices common to woman. Eluard places woman at the center, at the focal point of all creative art. Her dominant characteristics are complacency, passivity, and trust; she is "ensoleillée, illuminée, fleurie, confuse, caressante . . .," pervading the void, giving life and meaning to human activity, and banishing solitude. Man on the contrary represents an anomaly:

L'homme à l'instinct brouillé
A la chair en exil . . .
L'homme mortel et divisé
Au front saignant d'espoir. . . .
(p. 16)

Man's inspiration and altruistic drives come, says Eluard, from great emotional stimuli which give meaning to his otherwise meaningless existence. With a great love to live by, he reflects like a mirror this love upon others, for he wants every man to know his sublime happiness:

L'on m'aimera car j'aime par-dessus tout ordre
 Et je suis prêt à tout pour l'avenir de tous
 Et je ne connais rien de rien à l'avenir
 Mais j'aime pour aimer et je mourrai d'amour.

(p. 17)

The pathway is followed, however, by the guiding hand of woman, who remains at the cosmic center of the universe:

Par toi je vais de la lumière à la lumière
 De la chaleur à la chaleur
 C'est par toi que je parle et tu restes au centre
 De tout comme un soleil consentant au bonheur.

(pp. 29-30)

If humanity raises itself one step in dignity ("Si nous montions un degré"), if it is to accomplish each day one nobler act, then the reality of daily life will be the stage and the end goal, and all within the universe will find its explanation, its analogies, and its antitheses as related to the infinite:

Tout se vide et se remplit
 Au rythme de l'infini . . .
 La jeunesse est un trésor
 La vieillesse est un trésor . . .
 Et les yeux immortels
 Ont la forme de tout. . .

(p. 44)

We arrive in this manner at an understanding of Eluard's once nebulous and intangible dream, now translated into a philosophic "rhythm of the infinite," something which is dynamic, effervescent, unpredictable, yet within whose pattern of continual flux humanity takes its sustenance. We find there succinctly stated Eluard's formula for happiness: "Nous ne vivons que pour être fidèles / A la vie" (p. 45). Few verses can more eloquently impart the core of Eluardian theme than this counsel for universal harmony. After having passed through the shades of grief and despair, Eluard's faith in his fellow man, in the truth and application of human justice, is reasserted as something which will never succumb to the tyrant:

Je veux que nos mains et nos yeux
 Reviennent de l'horreur ouvertes pures . . .
 Je ne suis pas un fils de roi je suis un homme
 Debout qu'on a voulu abattre. (pp. 62-63)

Finally, castigating mercilessly the callous misanthropists in "L'Age de la vie," Paul Eluard harks back to the dedicatory lines of this volume. Despite them, he assures us, life holds out for all of us great promise:

En dépit des pierres
 A figure d'homme
 Nous rirons encore

En dépôt des cœurs
Noués et mortels
Nous vivons d'espoir

Rien ne nous réduit
A dormir sans rêves
A supporter l'ombre

Il n'y a sur l'heure
Doute ni soupçon
D'une heure semblable

A jamais sur terre
Tout remue et chante
Change et prend plaisir.
(pp. 87-88)

Indeed, it would be extremely difficult to find among contemporary French poets one who voices a more optimistic philosophy. Baudelaire's aphorism respecting life as "le miroir de notre désespoir" no longer holds in the reevaluation of the twentieth-century world. Eluard's poetry, on the contrary, offers meaningful vistas to guide our hopes. For the organic, homogeneous members of a society who are in truth "Les fruits semblables d'un arbre," there is neither "doute ni soupçon."

Johns Hopkins University

REVIEWS

Piers Plowman: The C-Text and Its Poet. By E. TALBOT DONALDSON. New Haven: Yale University Studies in English, Vol. 113; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1949. Pp. xii + 257. \$5.00.

The purpose of this able and conscientious book is "chiefly to demonstrate the probability that the author of C" is "the same as the author of B," but, since so much of the argument turns on what the poem means, the work is chiefly a discussion of what C and B, and to a lesser extent, A, are trying to say. The author's method is to reveal the similarity of the style and ideas of B and C and to show that the so-called misunderstandings of B by C are either not misunderstandings at all or normal changes or deepening of opinion. If we do not assume single authorship, the writer contends, we shall have to believe in "the most laborious act of forgery—and multiple forgery at that—ever recorded."

The general end of the study—to justify single authorship—sometimes gives parts of the book a forced quality and occasionally leads to special pleading (as on p. 193). It would perhaps have been better if the author had written a straight study of the C-text and had left the strong arguments for unity of authorship which emerge to a final chapter. As it is, practically every chapter is focused on the authorship argument, a procedure which sometimes distorts the force of the discriminating interpretation that we usually find in every part of the book. However, the problem of organization would have been exceedingly difficult in any approach.

Donaldson makes use of all the important scholarship on the poem which is relevant to his arguments. He does not, like so many who have done work on *Piers*, ignore the very important contribution which Burdach, one of the few scholars who has approached the poem from the broad European point of view, has made to the elucidation of the poem. For *Piers* obviously deals with issues which, as every historian of the fourteenth century knows, were dividing and agitating all of Europe at the time—questions of evangelical poverty, of a reformer emperor or king, of a *papa angelicus*, of predestination and grace, of salvation for unbelievers, and so forth. The period was filled with the sense of a coming great renewal, nourished on Joachimite writings. As Burdach himself has written, "Die grenzenlose Erwartung der Seelen auf eine kirchlich-religiöse Zeiterneuerung ist der Grundzug des 14. Jahrhunderts." All this is reflected in *Piers*.

A few points may be criticized. The author tends, I believe, to regard alliteration too mechanically (p. 20) as something added to style. His statistics on alliteration are, however, very valuable. He also takes too modern a view of medieval authorship (end of Chapter 2). I wonder whether C, or any medieval poet, would worry over "the dubious reward of anonymity" (p. 46).

I doubt whether Langland's individualism (pp. 110-11) is any more than the individualism implicit in traditional Christianity. Langland is perhaps a forerunner of the Renaissance in Europe (if he is not a Renaissance figure) because he felt that the world was on the threshold of a profound renewal, after a coming "period of troubles," but not because of his individualism. His political and social theories, going back originally to Plato, are of far too corporate a nature to be the basis of any modern individualism.

The author seems to think that one must be under "the strict discipline of a coherent philosophy" (p. 159) in order to qualify for the epithet learned. Inconsistent Langland may be, even confused, but I think we may surely say he was learned. We also find expressed in this study the old belief that *Piers* was directed at the humble (p. 163) and meant to be read aloud (p. 153). I wonder what audience could possibly have listened to an abstract poem (except for several vivid scenes) of some seven thousand lines.

Donaldson's excellences are written large all over this study—in his analysis of the meaning of various sections of the poem, in his comments on the poet's biography, in his study of C's politics, in his discussion of the general reliability of the C-text as we have it. He has made a genuine contribution to Middle English semantics in his discussion of several words: *loyalty* (pp. 65 ff.) and *recklessness* (pp. 171 ff.), although more stress might have been put on the mystical meaning of the term—the great step of throwing oneself trustingly on God. His interpretation of the problem of Meed's paternity (pp. 69 ff.) is excellent. His sharp aesthetic perceptions, as on page 74 when he points out the dominance of the image of the plow in the poem, enrich our appreciation. His criticism of the vast number of writers who take *Piers* primarily as social satire is well needed. His recognition, perhaps not full enough, of the apocalyptic elements in the poem, deserves our praise. In short, Donaldson has done an excellent job. Any future student of *Piers* can neglect this study only at his own cost.

MORTON W. BLOOMFIELD

Ohio State University

Writings on Elizabethan Drama. By J. LE GAY BRERETON. Collected by R. G. HOWARTH. Melbourne University Press, Australia, 1948. Pp. 115. 7s. 6d.

Probably most living scholars, if told that their current articles and lectures would be collected after their deaths and published in book form many years hence, would regard the prospect with nothing short of dismay. Scholarship moves on; new facts are discovered, old ones receive new interpretations; critical values and expectations change; old methods of approach tend to seem misdirected. It is not surprising, then, that these essays by the late Professor Brereton do not meet the ordeal of republication with complete success. He died in 1933, leaving behind him at the University of Sydney a reputation as an inspiring teacher. Out of devotion to his memory, Mr. Howarth has assembled five of his essays, two of them on Marlowe, and the rest on Shakespeare's *Richard II*, John Marston, and the Elizabethan Playhouse. In addition there is a series of textual notes on several of Shakespeare's plays and on Peele's *David and Bethsabe*. A select list of Mr. Brereton's publications closes the book.

Of the five essays, that on the death of Marlowe entitled "The Case of Francis Ingram" perhaps comes off best. Although written in 1904, long before the work of Leslie Hotson made the true facts known, it still reads well as a quite engaging satire on the wildness and complacency of the speculations of scholars on this or any other biographical problem. The companion essay, "Marlowe's Dramatic Art studied in his *Tamburlaine*," written in 1925, points out cogently the cumulative effects of the successive episodes of the two parts, but badly oversimplifies the intellectual elements in the play by attributing them all to the influence of Machiavelli. The essay on Marston, written in 1904, is a rapid

running summary and commentary on his plays, chiefly with an eye to characterization and poetry. We have come to expect a deeper psychological analysis and a more careful definition of the author's place in the contemporary drama than Mr. Brereton gives us. Similarly, in his study of the characters in *Richard II* (1931), the reader has to keep reminding himself that the essay was written before publication of recent work on Shakespeare's history plays, their sources, their political philosophy, and possible contemporary allusiveness. "The Elizabethan Playhouse" is a brief semi-popular presentation of the subject as it looked in 1918. Much less dated are the textual notes on Shakespeare at the end of the volume. These contain many shrewd emendations and interpretations of difficult spots in *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Much Ado*, and *Richard II*.

Mr. Brereton's personal charm and the lucidity of his writing do a good deal to make these essays still agreeable, but they served their most useful purpose in their own day.

PAUL H. KOCHER

Claremont Graduate School

The Philosophy of Francis Bacon. By F. H. ANDERSON. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948. Pp. vii + 312. \$4.00.

Professor Anderson has written a solid exposition of Bacon's formal thought. The book is primarily descriptive, an ordered statement of Bacon's positions, presented by means of paraphrase and résumé of the actual philosophical works, over thirty in number. Many of these the student of literature does not ordinarily read, and he will find items of interest in some of Professor Anderson's summaries. But he may well find tedious, as the reviewer has, the tireless recording of every step in the arguments of fragments that are often pointlessly repetitive since they are fragments of a system that Bacon never quite put together. This book, however, was plainly not written for the student of literature, who would prefer more critical summary and more evaluation. He must get from it what he can and be patient with Professor Anderson's method—remembering that far more criticism than exposition has been devoted to Bacon; and remembering, too, that a good deal of literary scholarship, whatever its method of summary, can be most reasonably justified on the grounds that it makes better critical evaluation possible.

Perhaps the most important result of Professor Anderson's study is the demonstration of the materialistic and mechanistic bases of Bacon's naturalism and the extent of that naturalism. The separation between philosophy and theology proves consistent with Bacon's system (whatever it may indicate concerning the limitations of that system). To summarize: Bacon uses Revelation to deny the discoverability of a Prime Mover and the first non-caused cause. (Since God made the world, His stamp is on any discoverable first cause.) Through study of the forms, processes, and schemes of nature man can discover God's art, but not His nature. The physics that will ascend to metaphysics, and discover the summary law of nature, will go no further than the first cause *within* nature. For nature has no divine mind, or form, or causation; it is formed matter acting through varieties of local motion inherent within itself, and to be studied (experimentally) in terms of motion, figure, and magnitude of bodies.

Many of Bacon's incidental attitudes are more clearly understood against

the background of his whole system. For instance, his reservations concerning the new astronomy, mathematics, or the work of a true scientist like Gilbert—these are consistent reservations. Bacon praises the accomplishments of empiricists, but their findings are too narrow and too likely to break the ascent from the least to the greatest axiom. The only answer, for Bacon, is a natural history and a philosophy of matter. As for mathematics, it is, like logic, a useful handmaiden, but has to be kept in its subordinate place.

What the student of literature will not find here is any new insight into Bacon's distrust of the imagination or into Bacon's attitude towards poetry. Given Professor Anderson's announced subject, there is no place for these topics. The imagination, along with the magnanimity (about which Bacon makes curious and significant remarks), has to exist outside of Bacon's system.

ARNOLD STEIN

University of Washington

The Gay Couple in Restoration Comedy. By JOHN HARRINGTON SMITH. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948. Pp. vii + 252. \$3.50.

Professor Smith's book is a study of the love duel between two young people who "disown the scandal of love, and call it gallantry, mirth, and raillery." This "gay-couple" serves as a thread to guide Professor Smith through pre-Restoration adumbrations of the type as found in the comedies of Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, Shirley, and Killigrew. He finds that this hero and heroine were strengthened by the cult of Platonism in the 1630's and attained their full stature in the comedies of Dryden and Etherege from 1660-1675. At their height, however, the seeds of decay were inherent within them, and Wycherley and his followers cynically damped the couple in their "cuckolding" plays of 1675-1687. In the decade of the 1690's, Professor Smith traces two forces of opposition to further use of the "gay-couple" as top figures in comedy: the reforming dramatists (Shadwell and his imitators) and the influence of the women in the audience. The turn of the century saw the decline of the couple at the hands of Steele who substituted reason and benevolence for the Restoration sex-antagonism.

On the whole, Professor Smith's study is an admirable development of Dobrée's thesis of sex-antagonism as the fountainhead of Restoration comedy. The book is particularly commendable in that it is based not only upon the major writers and plays of the period, but also upon the minor ones, which often better reveal the taste and trends of the milieu. Furthermore, his work is extremely readable: the style is informal and the scholarly apparatus is reduced to a minimum, but one does not feel that the author's evaluations are not based upon a substantial knowledge of his subject.

Perhaps present printing restrictions have forced Professor Smith to omit background material which would have strengthened his study. Adequate discussion of social forces is conspicuously absent. Why, for example, did the women of the 1690's prefer moral plays to the previous "cuckolding" type? The answer given—a native pride in their sex—is too facile. Again, no mention is made of Hobbesian philosophy in the treatment of anti-Platonism. The fact that the convention was becoming boring in comedy seems an inadequate explanation for the reaction he traces. In one instance where the author does

briefly touch upon social forces, his conclusions appear invalid: he dismisses the middle class as a factor contributing to the shift in comic theory after 1690 and emphasizes instead the influence of the women in the audience. This is an oversimplification of the problem and only substitutes one subsidiary cause for another. Perhaps the gravest weakness in the book is Professor Smith's begging the question of the morality of the plays. He rejects John Palmer's thesis that a work of art is moral if it expresses sincerely the code of the times and its author, yet he offers no alternative. After avoiding this problem, he tries, in his summary chapter to distinguish the "gay-couple" comedy from that after 1690 on the basis of morality: the former reflects the contemporary scene only, with its moral tone implicit in the plays; the latter is written on a conscious theory of morality.

These weaknesses are possibly not too injurious to the study since it is an unpretentious one, laying no claim to exhaustive treatment of Restoration comedy. It is simply a charmingly written essay, from whose pages the "gay-couple" step as quickened friends of Professor Smith.

DONALD B. CLARK

University of Missouri

Young George Farquhar: The Restoration Drama at Twilight. By WILLARD CONNELLY. London: Cassell & Company Ltd., 1949. Pp. 349. 21s.

Willard Connelly follows George Farquhar through a suggested childhood (about his "parents less is positively known than of the parents of Shakespeare"), Derry School in Ulster, Trinity College, and his growing interest in the theater through Robert Wilks and the Smock Alley Theater. After the famous stabbing of the actor Price, Wilks sent Farquhar to London to write plays, which he did, in an autobiographical manner, for the rest of his short life (he died before he was thirty). In London he picked up some friends at Will's, many mistresses, dramatic fame, a limited amount of money, and ultimately a wife (the supposedly rich widow Margaret Pemell, who had three children and ten years of life span beyond his own). He discovered there Anne Oldfield and the willingness of Susannah (Centlivre) Carroll, and even published his own love letters. Now his plays followed in rapid succession, sometimes evolving one from another, while in the intervals he did hack prologues and epilogues for other dramatists. But in Holland in 1700 "for his health" he had already shown signs of "lung trouble," which would thereafter relentlessly wear him down. His commission in the Grenadiers saved him financially in 1704, and that same year he played his own character Sir Harry Wildair at a benefit for himself in Smock Alley—and played it badly. But he got £100, and then two daughters in rapid succession, Anne Marguerite and Mary. Next he was sent to Lichfield and Shrewsbury to recruit and picked up there the material for his two most famous plays, *The Recruiting Officer* and *The Beaux Stratagem*, for which his *The Stage-Coach* in 1704 had really laid the foundation.

Back in London in 1706 he "was facing financial failure," and "he was ill." "He called it rheumatism," but he "still seems to have suffered from tuberculosis." In the hands of Dr. John Shadwell, son of "Tom the First," he writes a bad long poem *Barcelona*, and then disappears. Wilks finds him in a

garret in St. Martin's Lane and urges a new play. Farquhar, who has been reading Milton on divorce, responds by starting *The Beaux Stratagem*. He breaks at the end of Act II, but while moving steadily toward death, manages to collect himself and finish it, and send it "late in January [1707], to the endeared friend for whom he had written the character of Archer: Robert Wilks, at the Haymarket."

The play was produced March 8, 1707, and on "Tuesday, April 29, even on the day of the eleventh performance of *The Beaux Stratagem* . . . young George Farquhar died, dismally in his garret, high above St. Martin's Lane." The sad fate of his two little daughters occupies the Epilogue of the book.

Connely's scholarship in this book is easily the best he has displayed so far (see the Preface and especially the Notes by chapters at the end). The style, until the last two brilliant chapters, is never quite as scintillating as in *Brauwyn Wycherley*, but the brief digressions are always vivid: on Wilks (39-41), London in 1697 (51 ff.), the wits at Will's (55 ff.), Catherine Trotter (83 ff.), the Pemell story (204 ff.), Shrewsbury (236-37), etc. He has perhaps "discovered" the name of Farquhar's father (15, 25); he has carefully shown the turn from the Restoration ribald flavor to a more moral tone in Farquhar's plays (see especially pp. 98, 195, 219, 251, etc.); he has also richly illuminated the plays by pointing out the actual living people behind the characters (242, 249, 274-75, etc.); he has greatly enhanced our interest in *The Beaux Stratagem* by indicating the ideas of Milton in it; but principally he has throughout recreated a living, breathing man, George Farquhar: "scholar, actor, dramatist . . . the man who both in character and in what he wrote was the most human, the most natural, the gentlest, and the most encompassing in his appeal, of all those who had stamped comedy with the manners of the age."

Still there are some things we wish Connely either had or had not done. The accent on mistresses is far too pronounced; the developing illness, which after all was quite as important as all the women, is not carefully traced; there should have been more definite dating by years, especially in the middle of the book; some contemporaries of Farquhar seem to be slighted or even misinterpreted, notably Congreve and Swift. As a background for *The Beaux Stratagem* Connely could well have used for emphasis Trevelyan's total of only six divorces during the whole reign of Queen Anne. He also misses Allardyce Nicoll's accent on the value of the comedy of Murphy and Colman prior to Goldsmith; and his Index is hopelessly inadequate. "Haywood" (p. 300) should be Heywood.

To the present writer, however, the most startling discovery in the entire book (not noted by Connely or Nicoll or Page) is the fact that if Garrick and Colman did not "lift" parts of *The Clandestine Marriage* from Townley's *False Concord*, they very apparently did "lift" ideas for its conclusion from Farquhar's *The Stage-Coach*.

R. W. BABCOCK

Wayne University, Detroit

The Language of Natural Description in Eighteenth-Century Poetry. By JOHN ARTHOS. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Publications in Language and Literature, Volume XXIV, 1949. Pp. xiv + 463. \$6.00.

The problem of the relationship between science and the arts has extraordinary significance for our time. Whether we bemoan the impact of science on Western culture or hail it, we desire to understand it. Professor Arthos' work is in this field of inquiry; he attempts to demonstrate a very close relationship between the thought of the scientist and the language of the poet. According to Whitehead, "Mathematics supplied the background of imaginative thought with which the [seventeenth-century] men of science approached the observation of nature." It is Arthos' thesis that the scientists supplied the language with which the Neoclassic poets approached the description of nature.

His subject is the "stock diction" in the poetry of natural description of the eighteenth century, that favorite football for critics since Wordsworth. Adopting Quayle's formulations of the distinguishing characteristics of stock diction, Arthos comes closely to grips with the essential problems of the subject: what are the sources of the poetic language? how is it used? why (most puzzling of all) was it valued? In a closely reasoned and informative text of eighty-eight pages, he develops his principal theory: that many poets took their stock vocabulary from the language of old philosophies of nature. They "exploited a stable language because they believed that the design of the world was stable," perhaps, indeed, because "they considered the interests of poetry and natural philosophy to be the same in many important respects." The bulk of the book consists of three massive and erudite appendixes documenting his thesis.

Appendix A, labeled "Significant Words," lists words and phrases found repeatedly in the poetry of natural description in the eighteenth century. Under each term citations, chronologically arranged, are given, illustrating the early poetic use of the term; citations are full and representative, often extending, in many languages, from Homer to Pope. (Arthos cites little material after Pope on the theory that everybody knows about eighteenth-century usage.) Following many of the citations appear examples of the use of the same term in scientific prose. For instance, under the word "Aether" are thirty-two poetry citations, including passages from Homer, Empedocles, Sophocles, Aratus, Lucretius, Virgil, Prudentius, Avitus, Camoens, Ronsard, Du Bartas, Spenser, W. Chamberlayne, Milton, Sherburne, Dryden, Pope. There are twenty-four examples of the use of "Aether" from scientific prose, including passages from Aristotle, Argyropoulos, Daneau, Brahe, Lodge, Kepler, Wilkins, Comenius, Hobbes, Boyle, Huyghens, Newton. The bulk and the range of this material are impressive, particularly in the documentation afforded of the wide use of poetic diction before the eighteenth century.

Appendix B contains a list of common poetic paraphrases ("finny tribe," "*gens plumea*"); to read through the section on fish is depressing but illuminating. Again citations range from the Greeks to Thomson. A third appendix lists epithets formed with the suffix -y ("pulpy," "airy") as they appear in scientific writing.

Each appendix is logically integrated with the one preceding, and the total effect is somewhat overwhelming. One feels, however, that Arthos is riding his thesis hard; elaborate and learned as his treatment is, it is an oversimplification of an enormously complex problem. Certainly he establishes a close

relationship between stock diction and the language of science, and his explanation of why poets felt the need for a stabilized language is persuasive as far as it goes. But he takes no account of social and political forces as determining influences on language (as Bateson, for example, does in *English Poetry and the English Language*), and little account of purely aesthetic tradition (see Dryden's praise of the "*dictio Virgiliana*," which he "always endeavoured to copy"); these surely have crucial significance in any such problem.

One further criticism: throughout his text Arthos evinces a common, but unfortunate, prejudice against the language and techniques of the eighteenth-century poets. "The personification of abstract ideas and of material things is a notorious characteristic of neoclassic poetry" (p. 5). In sentences like this Arthos displays a failure of insight into the necessary distinction between the flabby use of a poetic technique (admittedly widespread in the period) and the general value of the technique itself. One might suggest Bronson's brilliant article, "Personification Reconsidered" (*ELH*, XIV [1947], 163-77), as an antidote. For just as Milton has recently been absolved by Mr. Eliot from responsibility for the bad poetry of the eighteenth century, so may we hope that personification, poetically used, will be reinstated as a respectable literary device.

Despite these lapses, one can have only admiration for the enormously wide reading represented here, for the diligence with which the evidence has been culled, and for the coherent organization Arthos has imposed upon his complex material.

ROBERT C. ELLIOTT

Ohio State University

The Cowden Clarkes. By RICHARD D. ALTICK. London, New York, Toronto: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1948. Pp. xiii + 268. \$4.50.

Professor Altick's biography of Mary and Charles Cowden Clarke is appropriately, if somewhat deceptively, light and lively of manner. Into his account of their long and pathologically cheerful careers, their multifarious literary undertakings, their innumerable contacts with the great and near great of the entire nineteenth century (Keats and Lamb to Edmund Gosse) has gone some of the arch chattiness and gaiety of the Clarkes' selves and of their time. And certainly a good deal of their inveterate literariness. It seems quite appropriate, for example, that in this biography of a pair of highly connubial litterateurs, whose waking eyes met "Angel Will Shakespeare" on the bedroom wall, and waking ears heard a ritual of matutinal poetry (recited from the pillow by Charles), there should be a graceful dedication to a collaborating wife, and that the chapter titles be lines from Shakespeare: "Come They of Noble Family?" "Yonder Comes a Poet," etc. These and other items give a congruent air of innocent pedantry. Indeed, there is enough gentle humor and affectionate familiarity in Altick's entire treatment to make it very pleasant reading.

But the book carries also much scholarly information and considerable critical insight. It is one more proof of the profit discoverable in intelligent study of minor figures. As the author explains in his "Note on Sources," surprisingly little has been written on the Clarkes. The fastidious might say, "No wonder," for nothing that the Clarkes wrote, not even Mary's *Concordance to Shake-*

speare, has held up. We now remember Charles barely as man-midwife to Keats's Homer sonnet and Mary hardly at all. The tales they told or retold from Shakespeare or modernized in Chaucer are mainly childish or emasculated. Their criticism, at its best, is in the worst romantic tradition, an effort to communicate an aesthetic impact by an act of translation, that is, to express the emotion generated by a work of art in another set of words (the critic's own). It results almost always in a grievous reduction of quality. Finally, Mary's blank versifications, although undertaken "with energy and assiduity," are as bad as this sample line indicates.

Professor Altick demonstrates all this with sympathy and restraint. He demonstrates also the service these two rendered in books and lectures toward popularizing "darling Willy" and Chaucer and moral behavior for little boys and girls.

More especially, he discovers in their long, gregarious, and "polygraphic" lives considerable documentation of an historical process that merits further study. For he shows us in the Clarkes that very thickening and softening of the romantic fibre which consolidated in the cheery plumpness of Victorianism, the settling of divine discontent into solid comfort, the subduing of passions and attitudes to the innocuous proprieties of the domestic-picturesque. We have, I believe, still much to learn of the sources and agents of this change, a chapter in the history of sensibility still to write. It is pretty clear that Leigh Hunt, who was a Clarkean idol, will figure importantly in such a history. Mr. Altick's penetrating observations will be useful to the historian.

JAMES R. CALDWELL

University of California

Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Biography. By RANDALL STEWART. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1948. Pp. 279. \$4.00.

Three new books on Hawthorne within the space of half a year! More new books on Hawthorne being dreamed about and written! There is no end, because there can be neither beginning nor end to the interpretation of the creative life of genius. Each new work raises as many if not more problems than it settles, because it widens and deepens the universal implication of the creative mind as expressed in art.

No doubt other biographers will expand and add new evidence to Professor Stewart's biography, but not without expressing their appreciation for what he has done to make the living, practical, everyday existence of Hawthorne convincing and real to the reader. The factual details of boyhood and college, of the lonely years searching for a meaning and for confidence in himself, marriage, children, politics, the pertinent details of the development of each book, publisher relationship, travel abroad, home and death are all treated with careful attention to detail. New material is added, and the whole is presented in a clear, objective style, and dramatized with the only bias a scholar admits, a warm affectionate feeling for the subject he is studying. This is a sound book, warm, friendly, and readable.

Hawthorne was the practical, ordinary man interested in the ordinary and commonplace problems of everyday life. That is clear in Professor Stewart's

biography, and it is a view that needed the careful analysis given it. He was also the darkminded genius preoccupied with the symbols of death, a profound awareness of sin, and a brooding, tragic sense of doom. It is not entirely clear from Professor Stewart's biography how a man so alive to the simple practical problem of meeting daily needs could have created the imaginative world of his fiction. In his effort to discount extravagant and fantastic speculations on Hawthorne the artist, of which there has been an abundance, Professor Stewart may have restricted himself too severely. He has punctured much of the romantic cloudiness of Hawthorne criticism, a type of writing too often based upon the feelings of the critic without knowledge of the facts. With this new biography the critic can make a fresh start. It expands the earthy horizons and gives impetus to new speculation founded on sound evidence.

SOPHUS KEITH WINTHER

University of Washington

Enemies of Promise. By CYRIL CONNOLLY. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948. Pp. x + 265. \$4.00.

This book was first published in 1938, "as a didactic enquiry into the problem of how to write a book which lasts ten years." As Connolly points out, "that limit is now reached and the book has survived; the proof lying in the fact that it has been republished"—and in what Connolly himself describes as a "revarnished" but otherwise unaltered edition.

But what exactly does survival of this kind prove? That Connolly's critical analyses and pronouncements have been vindicated? Or that a certain number of Connolly's readers, whom he refers to as his "educated fellow bourgeois," have the same interests and prejudices they had ten years ago? Survival on such terms is a questionable criterion. As it applies to the present book, it proves only that Connolly is at one with his readers, not that he has written a book which deserves to live. His work must therefore be considered on its own merits, apart from the vagaries of literary fashion.

Following Connolly's tripartite organization of the book, one can summarily describe it as (1) an interesting (at times brilliant) survey of twentieth-century English style; (2) an intelligent (if somewhat limited) analysis of the problems confronting the modern writer; (3) a fascinating "autobiography of ideas" intended first, to exemplify the theories of style set forth in parts one and two, and secondly, to present the facts and theories against which, in Connolly's own words, "the validity of my criticism must be measured."

The final autobiographical section completes Connolly's design—and for this design, other considerations aside for the moment, he deserves the highest praise. In so working out his book, he has helped to pioneer a basic approach and method that all modern criticism must eventually follow if it is to avoid the two extremes of impressionism and authoritarianism. Connolly recognizes that personal and ideological elements determine the nature, direction, and focus of contemporary criticism; that this situation, whether desirable or not, must inevitably hold true so long as the literate world is split into warring groups of naturalists and supernaturalists; and finally, that the only answer is for the individual critic to state plainly his position and the premises from which he is working.

The primary requirement of this critical approach (i.e., the necessity for clarifying his own position) Connolly meets with unusual insight and power. His autobiographical sketch (ironically entitled "A Georgian Boyhood") is a remarkable piece of self-analysis, and in addition, a penetrating study of the forces that shaped his intellectual and artistic development. Here, in passing, is his evaluation of English public schools (including Eton, his own school): "The experiences undergone by boys at the great public schools, their glories and disappointments, are so intense as to dominate their lives and to arrest their development. From these it results that the greater part of the ruling class remains adolescent, school-minded, self-conscious, cowardly, sentimental and in the last analysis homosexual."

Connolly spares no one, least of all himself. Working as a true artist, he draws a self-portrait that might easily stand alone as masterful autobiography, and that (in relation to his larger intention) defines the "why" behind almost every passage in the book.

But despite the soundness of his approach, and despite the quality of his autobiographical sketch, Connolly is unequal to his critical task. His stylistic criticism in Part I, though competent and at times illuminating, is really little more than a series of impressionistic notes and comparisons. As notes they are valuable, but they do not measure up to Connolly's intention—which is to present a definitive study of contemporary English prose.

Disregarding his own warnings against oversimplification, Connolly divides all modern prose styles into two main types ("Mandarin" and "Realist"), and then makes his ten-year survival the final test of excellence. "All we can say of the realists of the last ten years," he concludes, "is that nothing in their technique seems to have insured them against the disastrously short term of the writer's life." This is at best a tenuous point, and if true, there still remains a question as to its crucial relevance. If the realists have produced first-rate works—and Connolly admits that they have—what more can the critic ask? To condemn their techniques on grounds of literary fashion is to indulge in a higher form of commercialism.

And yet he goes still further. When he offers a new and improved style (his own version of "Mandarin"), he frankly prescribes it on the basis of "timing." While much of what he says is incidentally pertinent and true, he is fundamentally bemuddled by his concern for survival—so bemuddled, in fact, that his dicta would ultimately make the art of writing a literary Easter Parade, as exemplified by the style and substance of his own final pronouncement on "style." With the change of a word here and there, the following passage might be taken from an editorial note in *Vogue*: "Our language is a sulky and inconstant beauty and at any given moment it is important to know what liberties she will permit. Now all seems favorable. Experiment and adventure are indicated, the boom of the twenties has been paid for by the slump of the thirties; let us try then to break the vicious circle by returning to a controlled expenditure, a balanced literary budget, a reasoned extravagance."

Connolly here reveals his fatal ambivalence as a critic. His theories are radical, in the best sense of the word, but when he comes to apply them, he invariably thinks and writes like a trimmer. The result, as in his remarks on "experiment and adventure," is a confused attempt to establish a common ground between "art" and "success," the success of short-term survival.

It is this same ambivalence that undermines the second and title section of the book. Which is not to deny that, so far as he goes, Connolly makes excellent

sense. His "enemies of promise" (e.g., worldly success, journalism, sex, duty, politics) are well taken, and he analyzes their nature and meaning with considerable understanding. To single out one chapter: his treatment of politics and writing, though not particularly original, contains truths that cannot be too often repeated. And if he overstates at times, it is nearly always to emphasize a basically sound dictum—as when he says, "The poet is a chemist and there is more pure revolutionary propaganda in a line of Blake than in all *The Rights of Man*."

Yet always, when he departs from his mentors (Spender, Gide, etc.), he falls short of significant discovery. While he seems to have a theoretical understanding of the creative process, he cannot bring this understanding to bear upon the problems of the modern writer. The best he can do is to go a step or two beyond the obvious, and give the writer practical advice about what to do, and what not to do, e.g., "There is room now for comedy," since "We have no dandyism of the left." And so it goes. Compared with Alex Comfort's analysis of the same problem in *The Novel and Our Time*, Connolly's treatment is superficial.

What saves the book as a whole is its over-all approach and design, which forces Connolly to communicate more than he consciously intended, and ultimately, to dramatize his own failure. Seen against the backdrop of "A Georgian Boyhood," Connolly's inadequacies as a critic take on new meaning. They are transformed into a valid commentary on the nature and significance of artistic compromise. For Connolly's defeat is not merely his own. Like so many young artists and critics, he has been subtly victimized by his "school," by his "society," by his "times"—to a point where he is so anxious to fulfill his "promise" (as defined by middlebrow literati) that he cannot meet the demands of his own critical position. All this Connolly reveals, and with such rare honesty and courage that what at first reading seems to be just another volume of clever criticism finally emerges as a serious intellectual drama—a tragedy that lays bare the real enemies of art and truth in our time.

WAYNE BURNS

University of Washington

Tausend Jahre Deutscher Dichtung. Herausgegeben von CURT VON FABER DU FAUR und KURT WOLFF. New York: Pantheon, 1949. Pp. xlv + 489. \$4.50; textbook price, \$3.50.

Es gibt im Grunde wohl zwei Gattungen der Gedichtanthologie, die man bislang nicht immer hinreichend unterschieden hat. Die niedrigere ist letztlich eine buchtechnische Bequemlichkeit. Sei es, daß sie Zerstreutes und Unzugängliches vereinigt, wobei es nicht ohne Neuentdeckungen und Ehrenrettungen abgehen mag, sei es, daß sie als "Hort" oder "Hausbuch" den guten Ton pflegt, mehr als Bildungsritus zumeist als aus Kunstübung, gemeinsam ist allen Spielarten, daß sie Vorläufiges und Notbehilfliches leisten in Hinblick auf eine Gesamtheit des Verfügbaren. Eine solche Anthologie kann auftreten als Raritätenkabinetts oder Paradeschau, als Eselsbrücke oder Leitfaden, zuweilen mit erheblichen wissenschaftlichen Ansprüchen, immer weist sie mehr oder minder ausdrücklich über sich selbst hinaus auf umfassendere Bestände.

Stefan George und Karl Wolfskehl verdanken wir das *Deutsche Dichtung* betitelte Vorbild für die Anthologie großen Stils, deren Vertreter an den Fingern zu zählen sind. Diese gibt sich als durchaus eigenwertiges Gebilde und

unterliegt formal eher den Strukturgesetzen des Kunstwerks als den Funktionsnormen der Wissenschaftsleistung. Ihr höchstes Ziel, die Verbindung von Ursprünglichkeit und Maßgeblichkeit, ist der Kunstabsicht analog, und Borchardts *Ewiger Vorrat deutscher Poesie*, eines der wenigen dem genannten ebenbürtigen Unternehmen, verfolgt es, eigenwillig bis zur Abwegigkeit und mit einer förderlichen aber nicht durchwegs unanfechtbaren Vorbehaltlosigkeit des Geltungsanspruchs.

Die vorliegende Auslese ist ihren beiden großen Vorgängern weitgehend verpflichtet. Nur um Weniges weitherziger als diese erfolgte sie sichtlich unter Anwendung strenger Wertmaßstäbe und hält sich gleich frei von geschmacklichen Absonderlichkeiten und charakterlosem Eklektizismus. Sie wird bei aller richterlichen Unerbittlichkeit im Einzelnen der Vielfalt geschichtlicher Erscheinungsformen durchaus gerecht, auf andere Weise freilich, als das auf Dichtermomente abzielende ältere Muster und Borchardts Versuch, die historische Abfolge durch Überordnung einer urbildlichen Morphologie genetisch zu berichtigen. Daß die neue Sammlung in Auswahl und Schwerpunktverteilung geradezu konservativ wirkt, spricht nicht gegen sie, sondern erweist nur die traditionsbildende Macht der Vorarbeiter. In Gliederung und Rundung ist sie unübertrefflich und vermittelt so fast unmerklich die gleiche nachhaltige Klärung und Festigung der Grundanschauung, wie das Vorwort, das eine edle und verbindliche Auffassung vom Wesen des Dichterischen mit Beschwingtheit und meisterlicher Prägnanz vertritt.

Die elf Jahrhunderte deutscher Poesie zwischen dem Wessobrunner Gebet und den Versen Georg Trakls sind anhand von 466 Gedichten dargestellt. Der Löwenanteil des verfügbaren Raums, mit 70 Seiten fast ein Siebentel, fällt erwartungsgemäß an Goethe. Nächst ihm wurden Hölderlin (37 S.), Schiller (22 S.), Brentano (21 S.), Mörike (18 S.), Novalis und Rilke (je 17 S.) und George (14 S.) am ausgiebigsten berücksichtigt. Die vorgeoethische Dichtung, das Werk Goethes, Schillers und Hölderlins und die von Novalis bis zu C. F. Meyer reichende Zeitspanne beanspruchen jeweils die gleiche Seitenzahl. An die Lyrik seit Nietzsche hingegen, für die nur sechs Dichter zeugen, ist weniger als ein Fünftel des Buches gewandt worden. Daß Dichter wie Mombert, Stadler, Stucken, Heynicke, Loerke, Borchardt, Schröder und Weinheber, um nur die am schmerzlichsten Vermißten zu nennen, nicht zu Wort kommen, geschieht wohl vornehmlich in der Absicht, einem künftigen und somit befugteren Gericht freie Hand zu lassen. Damit bleiben zwar die Proportionen gewahrt, *sub specie aeternitatis* gleichsam, aber manchem ist kein Recht geworden und heute Dringliches bleibt unausgesprochen.

Der Eigentum der vertretenen Dichter und die Grundlinien ihres Werks sind dank einer allorts spürbaren Bedächtigkeit im Aussondern fast durchwegs getreulich vermittelt. Nur Platens höchstes Wollen, das erst an den klassischen Formen seines Spätwerks ersichtlich wird, bleibt unbestätigt, und Theodor Storm ist wohl zu eindeutig als Landschaftsdichter aufgefaßt. Wiegt nicht *Hyazinthen* etwa (*Ich möchte schlafen, aber du mußt tanzen*) alles hier Abgedruckte auf? Derlei Einzelheiten jedoch fallen gegenüber der Gesamtleistung kaum ins Gewicht, und da das Buch auch in der Ausstattung alle Mitbewerber überragt—Taschenformat, Dünndruckpapier, Satztype und Einband genügen dem gepflegtesten bibliophilen Geschmack—steht zu hoffen, daß es die verdiente Verbreitung finden wird.

FRANZ RENÉ SOMMERFELD

University of Washington

Deutsche Metrik. By OTTO PAUL. 3. vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage. München: Max Huebner Verlag, 1950. Pp. xii + 166. D.M. 6.80.

Twenty years have elapsed since Otto Paul's *Deutsche Metrik* appeared in its first edition (1930). While the second edition (1938) presented little change, the third edition is a revised and considerably enlarged book, with a new introductory chapter on Indogermanic verse.

The purpose this handbook sets for itself is to afford the reader of German verse a basic guide to the correct metrical reading of German poems of all times. Paul is a disciple of Andreas Heusler, whose three-volume *Deutsche Versgeschichte* is the leading work in this field; and it is upon Heusler that Paul bases his briefer presentation. "Nach wie vor," says Paul, "bekenne ich mich zu den Auffassungen meines verehrten Lehrers" (p. ix). He follows Heusler in his principle of a widely varying time evaluation of syllables, and, for representation of these different time values, he employs his teacher's system of metrical script. This script, with its numerous symbols, is complicated enough to prove a deterrent to casual reading. It exacts far more careful study than, say, the easily read, simple code: $\times / \times /$ employed by Atkins' *History of German Versification* (1922), but affords a more accurate analysis of time values.

Metrics, or *Verslehre*, presents itself as the science of verse structure. But although classed as a science, there always remains a subjective element in metrical interpretations. A few illustrations selected at random from Paul will show what I mean.

Rather than Paul's reading: "ér greif dá' s'n hárnasch lác" (p. 50), I would find the accentuation more natural: "er gréif dá' s'n hárnasch lác." And upon checking this line from *Parzival* in Bartsch's edition (733, line 1641), I find that he too indicates this latter accentuation.

Rather than Paul's "daz ir dechéinér was wòrden wúnt" (p. 51), which seems to me whimsical, I would prefer "daz ir dechéiner was wòrden wúnt." In the verse "Die man nóch hát in grösser ácht" (p. 60), I find no objectionable displacement of natural stress in interpreting as smooth-flowing iambs "Die mán noch hát in grösser ácht." Instead of Paul's artificial stress upon *unde*: "leit únde láster mó'hte enstá'n" (p. 53), I would prefer the stress upon *leit* as more natural, with *unde* serving as a two-syllable *Senkung* (it is often given monosyllabic pronunciation); and I would recognize elision of the weak -e in *möhte* before the following vowel, thus avoiding a two-syllable *Senkung* with hiatus: "léit unde láster mó'hte enstá'n." Instead of a reading with "Hebung pausiert": "nu hólz _A nu héidè" (p. 52), why not: "nú hólz, nu héidè"?

In his paragraph 94, Paul presents the generally accepted principle of dropping an unaccented vowel -e: "Lange Innentakte und Auftakte lassen sich bisweilen verkürzen durch Ausstoßung eines . . . tonschwachen -e. Beim Zusammenstoßen zweier Vokale, Hiatus, eines Endvokals und eines Anfangsvokals: alle e, kann entweder der erstere fortfallen, durch Elision, oder der letztere durch Synalöphe. Weitere Kürzungen: Krasis: Aus zwei getrennten Wörtern entsteht ein einsilbiges." In "únde ouch dúrch der wí'be ló'n" (p. 62), why not, then, elide the -e in *unde*, before a following vowel; and in the line: "jò enwás ich níht ein éber wíldè" (p. 63), $\cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup | \times \times | \text{---} | \times \text{---}$, why not shorten the long *Auftakt* by employment of *Krasis*, pronouncing: "jónwás . . .?"

Similarly, in the line: "Üns hat der wínter geschádet úber ál" (p. 64), which Paul analyzes: $\times \times \times | \times \times \times | \cup \cup \times \times | \times \text{---}$, why not recognize contraction

in the perfect participle, *geschadet* > *geschadt*, since so doing would regularize the movement of the dactyl?

Paul's general principles, like those of his master Heusler, are sound. The book affords the student of German metrics an excellent, compact survey of the history of German verse and a good introduction to the analysis of German rhythms.

CLAIR HAYDEN BELL

University of California

Luthers Lieder und Gedichte. By WILHELM STAPEL. Mit Einleitung und Erläuterungen. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1950. Pp. 245. D.M. 9.80.

It is more than four centuries since Martin Luther published his first collection of hymns. Since that time, great changes have taken place—not only in the German language, but also in German metrics. That the German people may not become increasingly estranged from the priceless heritage of these great songs, Wilhelm Stapel has prepared this volume. It contains, first, an excellent discussion of Luther as a poet, together with an illuminating analysis of the various songs, including a treatment of language and metrics, and with a detailed commentary that affords a new understanding of the hymns; and second, the songs and poems themselves, with texts faithful to the originals, except for a modernization of the orthography.

With its attractive paper and printing and its handsome linen binding in black and gold, the publishers have produced a work of art. The volume deserves a place upon the shelf of educated families, alongside the family Bible and the hymnbook.

CLAIR HAYDEN BELL

University of California

The Influence of English on the German Vocabulary to 1700. By PHILIP MOTLEY PALMER. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in Linguistics, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1950. Pp. 37.

The shelves of the Harvard Library still maintain silent and bulky witness to the efforts of Professor J. A. Walz to build up a collection of dictionaries in all European languages in all periods, with the aim of beginning a new form of cultural study based on vocabulary and vocabulary change in various historical contexts and with varied foreign influences. The word studies of Professor Walz found *passim* in the unfortunately short-lived *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung* furnish us with numerous *Schulbeispiele* of the type of consequential philological-cultural-historical scholarship which can be undertaken on the basis of such vocabulary investigation.

Professor Palmer is one of the pioneers of the newer generation in the study of this same important aspect of culture, and it is encouraging to note that he intends to continue his studies of the German vocabulary. The obvious importance of the project need not be explained in great detail. Studies of this nature open up roads toward more logical and essentially truer methods of solv-

ing the larger and broader questions which the cultural historians are likely to pose: What type of concept is missing in a certain language which must needs be borrowed from a foreign source? Can cultural fads and their importance in certain areas be measured in terms of the use of the foreign words they sweep with them? Does the date of the borrowing of groups of words indicate cultural influence of any type? The questions are indeed legion, and the answers have been woefully ill-documented thus far.

Palmer's study lays the foundation for a more accurate appraisal of these various situations and provides us all with an example of how this sort of work can best be done. The four-page introduction outlines the problem quickly and concisely. One more page of introductory material follows, consisting of two most useful tables, one listing the English words borrowed into German according to first occurrence in a German context, and the other an alphabetical listing of the same words.

As each word is listed, it is provided with a suitable definition of its German connotations and the date of its earliest recorded appearance in English. In most instances a concise discussion of the use of the word in German follows, including facts of interest concerning the word, e.g., highpoint of popularity in Germany, instability of orthography, etc. Then Palmer lists actual citations in which he has found the word in question, in most cases giving a representative survey from the first occurrence of the word down to the twentieth century. Finally, mention is made of the various German dictionaries of importance which give space to that same word.

Most interesting from the general scholarly point of view is the discovery Palmer has made in connection with the word "Pickelhering." For he points out that *NED* gives the first citation of the word "pickelherring" in English with the meaning of "clown, fool" in a 1711 text, and he also indicates that the word occurs in a fairly obscure context in *Twelfth Night* (I, v). If the word in Shakespeare actually means "fool, clown," then the word would be a foreign word in German. However, I remain unconvinced by the meagre evidence thus far advanced, by Palmer and by other lexicographers, that the word is actually of English provenience. It must be admitted, however, that Palmer is the first person to see the importance of the issue and to take a definite stand on the matter. The last word on "Pickelhering" has not yet been spoken, but at least the discussion is opened.

RICHARD J. BROWNE

University of Notre Dame

A Word Geography of the Eastern United States. By HANS KURATH. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Studies in American English, I, 1949. Pp. xi + 88 + 163 charts. \$4.00.

This work represents what may well be the most important study in the field of American English since the publication of the huge *Linguistic Atlas of New England* (1939) by the same editor. Much of the material found in the New England atlas has been utilized here, of course, but the items have been selected upon the basis of their greater geographical significance. In this way the work on the Linguistic Atlas of the United States (and Canada) has been able to progress in spite of a desperate lack of funds and the loss of the incomparable Guy S. Lowman.

Professor Kurath has undertaken in this volume to delineate the major speech areas of the eastern United States and the various subdivisions of each area. Of special note in this connection is the establishment of a Midland Area (as the author terms it), for it has long been our habit to identify northern and southern dialects as if they were representative principals in the War between the States. As one may gather from the introductory chapter, the interpretation of linguistic data on geographical lines is based upon historical information, to which linguistic geography is, in turn, a new contributor, so that it is to be regarded, in effect, as a sociological discipline. In providing a basis of study for such a discipline, the United States affords an ideal laboratory for the examination of speech mixture, dialect areas, bilingualism, and a whole host of problems which have previously been attacked by means of conjectures involving uncritical observations, corrupt texts, and constellations of hypothetical words.

The role of the Pennsylvania Germans in determining the cultural morphology of the eastern United States, for example, is here illustrated in one of its most striking phases (cf. Figs. 19, 21, 23, 24). Equally marked is the influence of the Hudson Valley Dutch. The westward migration of peoples from these and other primary settlement areas will certainly furnish an interesting study when information from the rest of the United States is available. All the more necessary, therefore, is the material in the present volume, in order that the complicated features of secondary settlement can be more readily understood when they are encountered later on. The term "chivaree," for example, which is so uncommon in the eastern United States, has been discovered by Dr. Raven McDavid to be general in the Middle West and the West; a native of western Oregon reports using the following "northernisms": "sick to the stomach," "darning needle" (i.e., dragon fly), "gunny sack," "teeter totter" (i.e., seesaw), "string beans," and "baby buggy" (not "carriage"), but he also uses the term "belly buster" (for sledding)—which the Word Geography limits to Virginia and its western environs.

But a vocabulary survey such as the present one, limited, as it must be, to words of restricted use or application, is bound to represent a relatively small linguistic sampling (97 items with more than 800 variants). Moreover, it has often been demonstrated that vocabulary is subject to rapid change, both semantically and geographically. For these reasons we find here a rather unusual selection of terms, a good many of which will seem odd to the city dweller (more than a third of the items pertain exclusively to farm and country). On the other hand, items of vocabulary are frequently quite spectacular, fairly easy to establish, and conveniently adaptable to cartographic presentation, since they do not represent a system. A judicious choice of vocabulary, however, gains much wider interest, in general, than a technical treatise on phonetic structure. But for the specialist, a geographical survey of American pronunciation is still the most needed aid in the field. That is a project for which Professor Kurath and his trainees alone are equipped, and one which they will undoubtedly complete before long. Since the series in which this volume appears is entitled: "Studies in American English, I," we may look forward with optimism to the appearance of other valuable works in this line by the same author.

With respect to the present volume, a special note of tribute should go to the University of Michigan Press, which has not only done a fine job of printing and binding, but has permitted itself to indulge in the publication of a number

of linguistic works that will have permanent value for the scholar. Just as the University of Michigan is now considered a Mecca for linguistic endeavor, so too its press has become an outstanding organ of linguistic publications.

CARROLL E. REED

University of Washington

Julie or La Nouvelle Héloïse: A Synthesis of Rousseau's Thought (1749-1759).

By M. B. ELLIS. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1949. Pp. xxvii + 209. \$3.85.

The fundamental conviction underlying M. B. Ellis' analysis of *La Nouvelle Héloïse* is implied in the title of her work. In brief this conviction is the following: Rousseau's work from 1749 to 1759 forms an integrated system of moral thought that is logically and consistently applied in all his works written during this period. The system of Rousseau's thought could thus be analyzed by taking as a starting point any of the works written between 1749 and 1759, but the *Nouvelle Héloïse* is the work in which the system finds its most complete application.

M. B. Ellis thus insists that there is intrinsic consistency during that period, rather than either contradiction or progressive development, the points stressed by many previous interpretations of the philosopher of Geneva. It is in the nature of Miss Ellis' analysis that she draws her interpretation not only from the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, but from all the major works written during that important decade of Rousseau's life, in order to make Rousseau's philosophy emerge as an integrated system.

The résumé of M. B. Ellis' analysis which follows here must be short and thus necessarily suffers from some oversimplification, but a review which is an analysis of an analysis can do full justice neither to Rousseau's system nor to M. B. Ellis' penetrating study of it.

Professor Ellis divides her book into two parts. The first part contains a description of the Rousseauistic moral and political ideal; the second deals with the ways in which this ideal may be achieved. This organization in itself seems felicitous: Rousseau was always concerned not only with the description of a philosophy, but also with the action to realize his ideals. The organization of Miss Ellis' book is thus a consistent application of the Rousseauistic dichotomy of *dire* and *faire*.

The method used by Professor Ellis is based on two premises: first, that Rousseau's philosophy can be best understood if we arrive at an exact definition of the key terms of his thought (for instance, Nature or Virtue); and second, that the Rousseauistic ideal and its practical implementation are embodied in the person of the heroine of *La Nouvelle Héloïse*.

The concept in which Rousseau's philosophy is anchored is that of Nature. In terms of moral philosophy the good or natural instinct is that of self-preservation or love of self. Whatever is an outgrowth of this emotion is consistent with human nature and therefore good. Included in this category of love of self is also love for others, if it is produced by identification of the self with the beloved person.

These natural or good emotions must be distinguished from what Miss Ellis calls the unnatural or bad passions produced by society. These emotions, such

as vanity or passion which does not lead to ultimate happiness, are a travesty of the natural emotions and are opposed to man's ultimate happiness. It is the driving power of those unnatural passions which is the force behind Julie's love affair with Saint-Preux. The story told by *La Nouvelle Héloïse* is essentially the victory of the natural emotions over unnatural passions within the heroine.

Within society there are social institutions (such as the family) in which natural emotions, and with them man's ultimate happiness, find their fulfillment. Adherence to such institutions is Rousseau's concept of Morality. On a higher plane than Morality, which requires only conformity to good social institutions, is the quality of Virtue. Virtue is that active energy or will-power which enables an individual to adhere to desirable social institutions and to resist the temptations of bad passions. Julie, in resisting after her marriage the temptations of Saint-Preux, is thus moral and virtuous in the Rousseauistic sense. It is interesting to note that, keeping Miss Ellis' definition of Rousseau's Virtue in mind, we can reconcile Rousseau's use of the term in connection with Julie's moral fortitude, as well as in the eulogy of the qualities of the Roman citizen. For Julie, in adhering to the principle of the family, upholds a social institution based on the natural *amour-de-soi*, just as the patriotism of the Roman citizen upholds a social institution based on *amour-de-soi* in collectivized form.

Professor Ellis also feels that *La Nouvelle Héloïse* describes a political ideal, claiming that the Wolmar estate is really the description of an idealized society. This suggestion seems plausible, for as Professor Ellis points out the Wolmar estate seems to meet Rousseau's requirements for a good society. The members of the household and servants are incorporated into the estate before they can be corrupted by bad society; they are animated with that desire for the common good which is ultimately identical with their own good and thus directly connected with love of self. They are taught by the good example of their superiors rather than by authority, a way of teaching which Rousseau condemned as an obstacle to the development of the all-important self.

Among the ways which lead to the accomplishment of Rousseau's ideal, Professor Ellis recognizes five: Conscience, Religion, Reason, Liberty, and Education. Conscience, for Rousseau, is the voice of Nature. It is that ever-present inspiration that guides us to act according to the principles of nature. Yet this voice of nature is only too often drowned out by the voice of the bad passions. In connection with her discussion of Conscience, Professor Ellis is particularly successful in demonstrating the identity of Conscience with what Rousseau calls the Constant Will of the individual and the General Will of society. The General Will of society is then essentially collectivized Conscience. The General Will is thus revealed as a moral principle rather than the ancestor of either democratic government or totalitarianism.

As far as the role of Religion is concerned, Professor Ellis sees clearly the secondary place to which it is relegated in the moral system of Rousseau. For in Rousseau's moral philosophy Religion is a way to achieve morality, but it is not the source from which the principles of morality are derived. Professor Ellis is thus quite right in not mentioning Religion at all in the description of Rousseau's ideal but in mentioning it as a tool to be used in the achievement of the ideal. This strictly utilitarian concept of Religion in Rousseau could be corroborated by its place in the *Social Contract* where it is utilized as a binding element in society, and its position in *Emile*, where the Vicar of Savoy and his profession of religious faith are introduced to keep Emile along the lines of moral conduct at a critical point in his life, when he is first confronted with

love and passion.

In connection with the role of Reason, Liberty, and Education, Professor Ellis' contributions are interesting, but perhaps less significant. As far as Reason is concerned, Professor Ellis points out that Rousseau believed in what one might call Natural Reason (*la saine raison*) which is directly inspired by the natural emotions, and also in Intellectual Reason which is the process by which we arrive at valid conclusions. Rousseau's protest against Reason was really against the type of Rationalism that had no foundation in the natural qualities of man, and which tended to overcome them. As far as the role of Liberty in Rousseau's system is concerned, the logical conclusion is that Liberty means living according to the principles of Nature. In addition, the role of Liberty is narrowed down by a certain amount of determinism which Rousseau admits as an important factor. Education, finally, according to Rousseau, must of course be directed toward the preservation of the love of self and toward its transformation into moral and virtuous attitudes required by the good society. Here Professor Ellis makes the fairly obvious, but often neglected, point that Education for Rousseau means adaptation to society if society is good, and isolation from society if the latter is bad. This simple explanation resolves the contradiction which is often seen in Rousseau's advocating Education of the individual in isolation (in *Emile*), by the state (for instance, in the constitutions of Corsica or Poland), and again by the family (as in *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, where, however, as Professor Ellis suggests, the Wolmar family is symbolic of the good society or the state).

On the whole it can be said that Professor Ellis' attempt to interpret Rousseau as a logical and consistent philosopher is successful and presents for future Rousseau scholarship a definite encouragement to continue the study of Rousseau along those lines. In reading Professor Ellis' book one becomes aware of the fact that previous interpreters have often accused Rousseau of inconsistency merely because they were unable to follow Rousseau's thought. Miss Ellis avoids the confusion of Rousseau's life and Rousseau's work, a confusion which has plagued Rousseau scholarship and helped to create the notion of Rousseau as the asocial romantic dreamer. But Miss Ellis shows that when we study Rousseau's work carefully this notion dissolves and the consistent philosopher appears.

A further merit of the book lies in the fact that it concentrates on the attempt to understand Rousseau and does not trace influences, real or imagined, or engage in lengthy comparisons of Rousseau's thought with that of others. What is disappointing, however, is that after arriving at the penetrating interpretation of some of Rousseau's most important works, Professor Ellis makes no attempt to place Rousseau's thought in the history of ideas; nor does she add significance to her work by trying to relate Rousseau's position to the modern problems of humanity. The moral system of Rousseau that Miss Ellis so brilliantly reveals is an attempt to base morality not on a religiously revealed moral code, but on an anthropological fact found in the nature of man (namely, self-preservation or love of self). This in itself is certainly worthy of comment, for it reveals that Rousseau saw the problem that would be created by the application of the method of the natural sciences to the traditional values on which morality was based. Thus while Rousseau's confreres in the *Encyclopédie* were still engaged in an effort to destroy tradition, Rousseau was already concerned with replacing this tradition by a new basis for morality. Rousseau's quest for a moral absolute that could be established as a scientific fact is thus the problem seen by the

social sciences only in the twentieth century, when they became aware of the relativistic skepticism which was the inevitable result of the destruction of traditional values by the scientific method.

As far as Professor Ellis' reluctance to draw broader conclusions is concerned, two possible reasons suggest themselves. The first may lie in the nature of the work which is taken as the starting point of the synthesis. Precisely because *La Nouvelle Héloïse* is the work in which Rousseau describes his ideal and his solution of the problems he saw, Rousseau's importance for modern times and his significance in the history of ideas are less poignantly revealed in *La Nouvelle Héloïse* than, for instance, in his Discourses. For Rousseau's importance lies in his recognition that progress in science and philosophy, and increased complication in the political and social structure, were no cause for unconditional rejoicing, but rather posed problems which had to be dealt with. It is this recognition that makes for the modernity of Rousseau, and not his political or moral solution of the problem, for the political solution of Rousseau—and this goes certainly for the one advocated in *La Nouvelle Héloïse*—is, as Rousseau realized, possible only in an extremely small and simple society. As far as the attempt to found a moral system not on religion but on a scientific absolute is concerned, one can, I believe, make the generalization that the great thinkers of today are becoming increasingly doubtful of this procedure.

Another reason for Professor Ellis' hesitation to give a wider interpretation of her findings may simply lie in the fact that her book will be followed by other works dealing with Rousseau's philosophy. A work treating the role of *Emile* in the evolution of Rousseau's thought is announced in the volume discussed here. Rousseau scholarship should not only look forward to the publication of this and other works by Professor Ellis, but may perhaps also hope that at some future date Professor Ellis will undertake to place her findings in the history of ideas.

Yet though Professor Ellis refrains from placing Rousseau, she goes to considerable lengths in comparing her interpretation of Rousseau with that of some of her predecessors. But the larger point of view again seems lacking. It would have enhanced the value of Professor Ellis' work to the reader had she placed her own work in the history of Rousseau criticism, as, for instance, Professor Schinz did in his well-known interpretation. The history of Rousseau criticism is in itself an important chapter in the history of ideas, for it reveals the stages by which humanity has come to a deeper understanding of Rousseau's premises of conflict and unavoidable tension.

ROBERT L. POLITZER

University of Washington

Rousseau: *L'homme et l'œuvre*. Par DANIEL MORNET. Paris: Boivin, 1950. Pp. 184.

L'excellente collection autrefois intitulée *Le livre de l'étudiant* vient de changer de rubrique, et s'appelle maintenant *Connaissance des Lettres*. Le premier ouvrage où se remarque ce changement est l'ouvrage de Mornet sur Rousseau. Comme R. Jasinski a indiqué que cette collection, qu'il dirige, s'adresse à un triple public (étudiants, spécialistes, "grand public"), on se rend compte de la difficulté de la tâche entreprise: satisfaire les gens du monde et les érudits. Les premiers s'intéressent surtout à la vie personnelle de l'auteur dont on leur

parle, les seconds aux œuvres et à la pensée de celui-ci. Mornet consacre peu de pages à la vie de Rousseau. Après un premier chapitre d'une quinzaine de pages sur la jeunesse et l'adolescence, viennent des chapitres qui, chacun, s'occupent des divers ouvrages du Citoyen de Genève, en même temps que quelques pages sur la "fin de la vie de Rousseau" et sur l'influence de ce dernier. Une note bibliographique termine le livre. Mornet remarque que tous les érudits ont leur Rousseau. Il résiste à la tentation d'ajouter le sien et cherche à se réfugier "dans l'enceinte étroite mais plus sûre de la critique historique objective." Il se propose de tracer "une sorte de cercle à l'intérieur duquel [il logera] le plus possible de certitudes qu'on ne saurait contester de bonne foi et sans parti pris." Son dessein est "de rassembler toutes les certitudes qu'un lecteur ou un critique ne saurait contredire sans tomber dans le paradoxe ou la fantaisie pure." S'il y a une certitude sur laquelle on doit insister, c'est celle-ci : tandis que le *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* fut d'abord publié à Paris, le second *Discours*, la *Lettre à d'Alembert*, la *Nouvelle Héloïse*, le *Contrat* furent publiés à Amsterdam, chez Rey. Mais l'*Emile* fut imprimé et publié à Paris. Mornet dit de la *Nouvelle Héloïse* (p. 87) : "Un libraire de Paris, Robin, reçut le droit exclusif d'imprimer en France le roman." Et il continue : "L'édition fut mise en vente à Paris au début de février 1761. . . . Cette première édition est fort incorrecte." En fait, Rousseau a dit d'elle à Malesherbes : "Permettez-moi, Monsieur, de vous représenter que la seconde édition s'étant faite à mon insu, je ne dois point ménager à mes dépens les libraires qui l'ont faite . . ." (*Corr.*, V, 342). Ainsi, le 28 janvier 1761, Rousseau qualifie cette édition de *seconde édition* ; c'était, en fait, une réimpression, par Robin, de l'édition de Rey, qui avait été expédiée d'Amsterdam, en novembre 1760. Il importe, donc, d'insister sur ce fait que l'édition originale de la *Nouvelle Héloïse* a été faite en Hollande, et non en France, comme on pourrait le croire en lisant les déclarations de Mornet. Et il est d'autant plus nécessaire de souligner tout cela que (p. 120), Mornet, parlant de l'*Emile*, affirme ceci : "En décembre 1761 l'ouvrage s'imprimait à Amsterdam. On commence la distribution des exemplaires imprimés en mai 1762." Or, l'*Emile* s'est imprimé en France à l'automne de 1761 et Néaulme ne semble avoir commencé son impression, sur les *feuilles* du libraire parisien Duchesne, que plus tard, car, le 29 janvier 1762, Rousseau écrit à Néaulme et lui dit : "J'estime que l'ouvrage aura au moins 60 feuillets : il est divisé en 5 livres . . ." (*Corr.*, VII, 81-83). L'édition de Néaulme ne semble avoir été terminée que vers la fin du mois de juin 1762, tandis que, dans l'*Extrait des Registres du Parlement* du 9 juin 1762, on lit ceci : "Ce jour, les Gens du Roi [. . .] ont dit : Qu'ils déferoient à la Cour un Imprimé en quatre volumes in-octavo, intitulé *Emile* [. . .] dit imprimé à la Haye. . . ."

C'est là l'édition parisienne de l'*Emile* faite par Duchesne, mais avec une fausse rubrique. C'est cette édition qui fut distribuée à partir du 22 mai 1762 et qui fut mise en vente le 27 mai ; elle se présente sous deux formats : in-8° et in-12. C'est là un fait dont les conséquences ont été tragiques. Rousseau avait fait tous ses efforts pour que l'*Emile* fût publié en Hollande, mais chez Néaulme, car on avait amené Jean-Jacques à ne pas vouloir de Rey. Il avait alors accepté Néaulme, mais ce dernier avait "donné pouvoir à M. Guérin pour conclure le marché avec Du Chesne. . . ." Or Néaulme était un ami du Guérin et Duchesne était un "homme de paille" du même Guérin. C'est ainsi que l'édition originale

de l'*Emile* fut imprimée et publiée en France contre le gré de Rousseau. On sait qu'après la condamnation de l'*Emile*, Rousseau ne publia presque plus rien, en dehors de la *Lettre à M. de Beaumont* (1763), des *Lettres de la Montagne* (1764), et de quelques ouvrages d'une importance relativement secondaire. Il a dit, lui-même, qu'il lui avait fallu dix ans pour calmer le délire dans lequel il avait été plongé; et l'on sait assez quelle fut l'existence troublée de Rousseau, à partir de l'*Emile*. Il est donc absolument nécessaire de dire les choses clairement. On ne doit laisser aucune équivoque: l'*Emile* a été imprimé et publié en France, pour la première fois. Personne, d'ailleurs, ne le nie; mais, souvent, on laisse entendre que ce n'est pas vrai. Mornet (p. 143) a dit que Rousseau se croyait assuré "d'être oublié du Parlement." Et il précise: "Mais l'ouvrage était signé. C'était un défi trop éclatant." Voilà l'argument si souvent ressassé: si Rousseau n'avait pas signé son livre, il aurait été sauvé. Répondons qu'il ne fallait pas imprimer en France un livre signé par Rousseau. Quant à voir une attitude de défi de la part de Rousseau, c'est absolument impensable et rien ne peut justifier une telle assertion. Disons aussi que la "note bibliographique" de Mornet ne mentionne que très peu d'ouvrages. Il aurait, pourtant, fallu signaler l'ouvrage de Ducros; l'*Etat présent des travaux sur J.-J. Rousseau* (Paris-New York, 1941) de Schinz; et l'ouvrage extrêmement important de A. Ravier, *L'Education de l'homme nouveau* (Issoudun, 1941). En conclusion, pourrions-nous faire du livre de Mornet sur Rousseau les éloges qu'on a décernés à celui de Naves sur Voltaire: "livre de premier ordre, où l'érudition la plus exigeante ne trouvera rien à reprendre . . ." ? Nous objectera-t-on que nous ne relevons que des vétilles dans ce livret du savant éditeur de la *Nouvelle Héloïse*? Rien, pourtant, ne nous paraît aussi important que de mettre en lumière—autant que cela est possible—les conditions¹ dans lesquelles, le 9 juin 1762, Rousseau a été déclaré de prise de corps.

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

¹ Puis-je me permettre de renvoyer à mon article "La condamnation de l'*Emile*," *Annales de la Société J.-J. Rousseau*, XXXI (1946-49), 209-45? Puis-je aussi dire que j'ai étudié, dans *Isis*, XL (1949), 341-44, "le langage mathématique de J.-J. Rousseau"? Quand, dès lors, Mornet (p. 106) s'exclame: "Que signifie ce passage?" à propos du chapitre i du livre III du *Contrat*, nous pourrions dire que ce chapitre est parfaitement clair. Nous devons aussi signaler que vient de paraître un ouvrage important de Henri Roddier, *J.-J. Rousseau en Angleterre* (Paris, 1950), et nous nous permettrons d'attirer l'attention sur un petit problème: Mornet (p. 156) répète, après tous les critiques, que Rousseau "arriva le 20 mai 1778" à Ermenonville. Or, je relève dans l'édition des *Rêveries* (Paris, 1948) par J. S. Spink, p. xlv, la déclaration de Girardin: les *Rêveries* "forment une espèce de journal . . . lequel journal . . . conduit jusques au jour de Paques fleuries dernier c'est à dire six jours avant sa sortie de Paris pour venir icy. . ." Comme le jour de Pâques fleuries tomba le 12 avril, en 1778, Rousseau aurait donc quitté Paris le 18 ou le 19 avril. Serait-il arrivé à Ermenonville le 20 avril au lieu du 20 mai? Sur Naves, citons la réflexion de J. Benda, *La France byzantine* (Paris, 1945), p. 128, n. 1: "La mort de cet auteur dans un camp allemand en 1944 est une des grandes pertes de la critique littéraire."

BOOKS RECEIVED

AMERICAN

- Ahnebrink, Lars. *The Beginnings of Naturalism in American Fiction: A Study of the Works of Hamlin Garland, Stephen Crane, and Frank Norris with Special Reference to Some European Influences, 1891-1903.* Upsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, American Institute in the University of Upsala, *Essays and Studies on American Language and Literature*, IX, 1950. Pp. xi + 503. \$3.50.
- Coffin, Tristram P. *The British Traditional Ballad in North America.* Philadelphia: American Folklore Society, 1950. Pp. xvi + 188. \$4.50.
- Coxe, Louis O., and Robert Chapman. *Billy Budd: A Play in Three Acts. Based on a Novel by Herman Melville. With a Foreword by Brooks Atkinson.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951. Pp. 56. \$1.50.
- Laws, G. Malcolm, Jr. *Native American Balladry: A Descriptive Study and a Bibliographical Syllabus.* Philadelphia: American Folklore Society, 1950. Pp. xii + 275. \$4.50.
- Schyberg, Frederik. *Walt Whitman. Translated from the Danish by Evie Allison Allen. With an Introduction by Gay Wilson Allen.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. Pp. xv + 387. \$5.00.

ENGLISH

- Bacon, Wallace A. (editor). *William Warner's Syrinx or A Sevenfold History.* Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1950. Pp. lxxxv + 223. \$5.00.
- Blum, Hermann Theodor. *Oliver Goldsmith: Eine Studie über die Anfänge seines Humors.* Konstanz: Echo-Druckerei- und Verlagsgesellschaft, 1951. Pp. xi + 115.
- Brodin, Gösta. *Agnus Castus: A Middle English Herbal Reconstructed from Various Manuscripts. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary.* Upsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, English Institute in the University of Upsala, *Essays and Studies on English Language and Literature*, VI, 1950. Pp. 328. 12/-.
- Clifford, James L. *Johnsonian Studies, 1887-1950: A Survey and Bibliography.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1951. Pp. ix + 140. Cloth trade edition, \$3.00; paper text edition, \$2.00.
- Davis, Herbert (editor). *The History of the Four Last Years of the Queen. With an Introduction by Harold Williams. Shakespeare Head Prose Works of Jonathan Swift, Vol. VII.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951. Pp. xxxvi + 252. \$3.75.
- Ehrsam, Theodore G. *Major Byron: The Incredible Career of a Literary Forger.* New York: Charles S. Boesen; London: John Murray, 1951. Pp. 217. \$6.00.
- Ennis, Lambert. *Thackeray: The Sentimental Cynic.* Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Studies, Humanities Series, No. 25, 1950. Pp. vii + 233. \$5.00.
- Faverty, Frederic E. *Matthew Arnold the Ethnologist.* Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Studies, Humanities Series, No. 27, 1951. Pp. vii + 241. \$5.00.
- Malone, Kemp. *Chapters on Chaucer.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1951. Pp. ix + 240. \$3.50.

- Miles, Josephine. *The Primary Language of Poetry in the 1940's*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in English, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1951. Pp. 383-542. \$2.00.
- Moore, Arthur K. *The Secular Lyric in Middle English*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1951. Pp. x + 255. \$4.00.
- Mordell, Albert. *T. S. Eliot's Deficiencies as a Social Critic; T. S. Eliot—Special Pleader as Book Reviewer and Literary Critic*. Girard, Kansas: Halde-man-Julius Publications, B 928, 1951. Pp. 56.
- Nicoll, Allardyce (editor). *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study & Production*. Volume 4. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1951. Pp. ix + 176. \$2.75.
- Nicolson, Marjorie Hope. *The Breaking of the Circle: Studies in the Effect of the "New Science" upon Seventeenth Century Poetry*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1950. Pp. xxii + 193. \$3.00.
- Spencer, Herbert. *Literary Style and Music, Including Two Short Essays on Gracefulness and Beauty*. Introduction by Charles T. Smith. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. x + 119. \$2.75.
- Strathmann, Ernest A. *Sir Walter Raleigh: A Study in Elizabethan Skepticism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. Pp. ix + 292. \$3.75.
- Tiverton, Father William. *D. H. Lawrence and Human Existence*. Foreword by T. S. Eliot. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. xv + 140. \$3.00.
- Triebel, L. A. *Fisher's Ghost and Other Essays*. Foreword by Walter Murdoch. Preface by E. Morris Miller. Melbourne and London: F. W. Cheshire, 1950. Pp. 208. 12/6.
- Whitelock, Dorothy. *The Audience of Beowulf*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1951. Pp. 111. \$2.50.

GERMAN

- Bruford, W. H. *Theatre, Drama and Audience in Goethe's Germany*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1950. Pp. xi + 388. 21/- net.
- Curts, Paul H. (translator). *Herod and Mariamne: A Tragedy in Five Acts, by Friedrich Hebbel (1848—published 1850)*. Translated into English Verse. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures, No. 3, 1950. Pp. 96. \$2.00, paper; \$2.50, cloth.
- Flach, Willy (editor). *Goethes Tätigkeit im Geheimen Consilium. Teil I: Die Schriften der Jahre 1776-1786. Goethes Amtliche Schriften. Veröffentlichung des Staatsarchivs Weimar. Erster Band*. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1950. Pp. cvi + 462.
- Grundmann, Herbert, and Hermann Heimpel (editors). *Die Schriften des Alexander von Roes*. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger. Deutsches Mittelalter, Kritische Studentexte der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Band 4, 1949. Pp. 134.
- Kosch, Wilhelm. *Deutsches Theater-Lexikon. Biographisches und Bibliographisches Handbuch. I: Lieferung*. Wien: Ferd. v. Kleinmayr Verlag Klagenfurt, März, 1951. Pp. 96.
- Mohler, Armin. *Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland, 1918-1932: Grundriß ihrer Weltanschauungen*. Stuttgart: Friedrich Vorwerk, 1950. Pp. 287. D.M. 11.80.
- Ott, Irene (editor). *Ruotgers Lebensbeschreibung des Erzbischofs Bruno von Köln*. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum, Nova Series, Tomus X, 1951. Pp. xxx + 69.

- Raith, Josef. Untersuchungen zum englischen Aspekt. I. Teil: Grundsätzliches Altenglisch. München: Max Hueber Verlag, Studien und Texte zur englischen Philologie, Band I. 1951. Pp. vi + 116.
- Stapel, Wilhelm. Luthers Lieder und Gedichte. Mit Einleitung und Erläuterungen. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1950. Pp. 245. D.M. 9.80.
- Strecker, Karl (editor). Die Lateinischen Dichter des deutschen Mittelalters. Sechster Band: Nachträge zu den Poetae Aevi Carolini. Erster Teil. Mit Unterstützung von Otto Schumann. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1951. Pp. vi + 230.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

- Bonwit, Marianne. Gustave Flaubert et le principe d'impassibilité. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 33, No. 4, 1950. Pp. 263-420. \$2.00.
- Bowden, John Paul. An Analysis of Pietro Alighieri's Commentary on the *Divine Comedy*. A dissertation. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. Pp. 131.
- Chinard, Gilbert (editor). Morelly: Code de la nature ou le véritable esprit de ses lois 1755. Publié avec une introduction et des notes. Copyright, Gilbert Chinard, 1950. Pp. 335.
- Decreus-Van Liefland, Juliette. Sainte-Beuve et la critique des auteurs féminins. Paris: Boivin et Cie, Editions Contemporaines, 1949. Pp. 153.
- Dubois, E. T. Portrait of Léon Bloy. London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1951. Pp. 125. \$2.00.
- Estudios de Filología e Historia Literaria: Homenaje al R. P. Felix Restrepo, S.I., Presidente Honorario del Instituto. Bogotá: Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo, Tomo V, 1949. Pp. xii + 581.
- Haac, Oscar A. Les Principes inspireurs de Michelet. New Haven: Yale Romanic Studies, New Series, No. 2; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1951. Pp. viii + 242. \$2.00.
- Howell, Wilbur Samuel (translator). Fénelon's *Dialogues on Eloquence*. With an Introduction and Notes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951. Pp. 160. \$3.00.
- Matluck, Joseph. La Pronunciación en el Español del Valle de México. México, D.F., Febrero, 1951. Pp. 123.
- Mesnard, Jean. Pascal: l'homme et l'œuvre. Paris: Boivin et Cie, Connaissance des Lettres, Ancienne Collection, "Le Livre de l'Étudiant," 1951. Pp. 192.
- Morreale, Margherita. Pedro Simón Abril. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Revista de Filología Española, LI, 1949. Pp. 329.
- Peyre, Henri. Connaissance de Baudelaire. Paris: Librairie José Corti, 1951. Pp. 236.
- Powys, John Cooper. Rabelais: His Life, The Story Told by Him, Selections Therefrom Here Newly Translated, and An Interpretation of His Genius and His Religion. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. 424. \$3.75.
- Putter, Irving. Leconte de Lisle and His Contemporaries. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 35, No. 2, 1951. Pp. 65-108. \$0.35.
- Rumbold, Richard (editor). Gustave Flaubert: Letters. Selected with an Introduction. Translated by J. M. Cohen. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. 248. \$3.75.

- Sanchez, Ramón Díaz. Guzman: Elipse de una ambición de poder. Caracas: Biblioteca Venezolana de Cultura, Ediciones del Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Dirección de Cultura, 1950. Pp. 604.
- Stone, Edward Noble (translator). The Song of William (La Chancun de Guillelme). Translated into Verse. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1951. Pp. xvii + 109. \$2.50.
- Tilander, Gunnar. Los Fueros de la Novenera. Upsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri, Leges Hispanicae Medii Aevi, II, 1951. Pp. 237.
- Unamuno, Miguel de. The Christ of Velasquez. Translated by Eleanor L. Turnbull. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1951. Pp. xiv + 132. \$2.50.

GENERAL

- Chan, Shau Wing. Elementary Chinese, with Romanization and Exercises in Speaking and Writing. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951. Pp. xxxi + 468. \$7.50.
- Flew, Antony G. N. (editor). Essays on Logic and Language. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. vii + 206. \$3.75.
- Hatcher, Anna Granville. Modern English Word-Formation and Neo-Latin: A Study of the Origins of English (French, Italian, German) Copulative Compounds. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1951. Pp. ix + 226. \$4.25.
- Jones, Daniel. The Pronunciation of English. Third edition entirely revised, enlarged, and reset. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1950. Pp. xx + 206. \$2.00.
- Matthews, W. K. Languages of the U.S.S.R. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1951. Pp. x + 179. \$3.50.
- Linguistic Bibliography for the Years 1939-1947. Published by the Permanent International Committee of Linguists with a Grant from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Utrecht-Bruxelles: Spectrum, 1949. I, xxiv + 240. \$4.00. II, xxi + 350. \$5.00.
- Newmark, Maxim. Dictionary of Foreign Words and Phrases. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. 245. \$6.00.
- Reed, David W. The History of Inflectional *N* in English Verbs before 1500. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in English, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1950. Pp. 157-328. \$2.00.
- Rudnyc'kyj, J. B. Canadian Place-Names. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, *Onomastica*, No. 2, 1951. Pp. 88.
- Trnka, B. Publication of the Committee on Linguistic Statistics: A Tentative Bibliography. With an Introduction by Marcel Cohen. International Permanent Committee of Linguists. Utrecht: Spectrum Publishers, 1950. Pp. 22.
- Ullman, Stephen. Words and Their Use. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. 108. \$2.75.
- Varneke, B. V. History of the Russian Theatre: Seventeenth through Nineteenth Century. Original Translation by Boris Brasol. Revised and edited by Belle Martin. New York: Macmillan Company, 1951. Pp. xii + 459. \$6.50.
- Viking Society for Northern Research. Saga-Book. University College, University of London. Vol. XIII, Part II, 1947-48. Pp. 51-114. Vol. XIII, Part III, 1949-50. Pp. 115-205.

a
i
:
A
-
l,
-
y
t
s
-
:
).
h,
y
e
-
y,
e-
y
r-
I.



ANNOUNCEMENT

The IIIrd International Congress of Toponymy and Anthroponymy has set up an International Committee of Onomastic Sciences, as well as an International Centre of Onomastics with its permanent office at the "Instituut voor Naamkunde" (Onomastic Institute), E. van Evenstraat 10, Louvain.

The Centre has been entrusted with the edition of a Bibliographical and Information Bulletin (*Onoma*). The first volume of *Onoma* (1950), which is now ready, contains, in the first place, a section reporting on the latest Congress, Communications by the Secretariate-General, and Information about the progress of Onomastics in the various affiliated countries (26); in the second place, the first series of retrospective onomastic bibliographies (Belgium: Flemish and Walloon regions, Bulgaria, Denmark, and Germany).

Several other bibliographies are at present in preparation at Louvain, others have been promised by colleagues abroad; they will be published in the next volumes of *Onoma*.

After the completion of the basic bibliography, annual current bibliographies will keep readers informed about onomastic publications in the various countries.

Professor H. J. van de Wijer, Director
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF ONOMASTIC SCIENCES

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS
SEATTLE 5

Brents Stirling
Parrington Hall

Entered at Postoffice as Second Class Matter, Seattle, Washington

---, Parrington Hall, Columbia University, New York City. All communications of a business nature should be directed to Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, or Mt. Royal and Guilford Avenues, Baltimore 2, Maryland.

Price: \$5.00 a year; single copies \$1.25

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

Frowsy looking MSS with blurred typing, narrow margins and crowded lines, cramped notes at the bottom of the page, and reference symbols incorrectly styled no longer need plague editors and printers if contributors will invest ten cents (single copy price) in the purchase of the *MLA Style Sheet*, reprinted from *PMLA*, April, 1951. This compilation of stylistic forms (32 pp.) has been agreed upon by the editors of seventy-eight journals and thirty-three university presses and represents the majority practice or recommendation.

For copies and statement of prices, address:

Treasurer, Modern Language Association

100 Washington Square East

New York 3, New York

